ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED002512
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). N.A.
3. IDENTIFICATION NO. CR-1339

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Lin, San-Su C.

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Teachers College
Columbia University
ST. New York 27, New York
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Bureau of Publications
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York 27, New York

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

10. VOL. N.A.
11. PAGES N.A.
12. MO./YR. 1965
13. TOTAL PP. 228

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

racial factors
language arts
experimental study

English
speech
achievement
higher education

background
language laboratories
measurement
evaluation

dialects
nonstandard dialects
teaching techniques
Negro students

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The extent to which pattern practice techniques helped Negro students who needed to master standard English as a second language was investigated. Materials and procedures to implement such techniques were worked out. The subjects attended Claflin College, an all-Negro four-year college in South Carolina. Approximately 65 to 70 freshmen were placed in four project sections.

In the study's first year such practice materials as 60 language laboratory lessons recorded on tapes and the methods and procedures for their use were developed. In the second year, evaluative measures, including a local grammar test and a checklist for evaluating essay tests and interviews, were developed. In the third year, a final evaluation was conducted by dividing the project sections into two control and two experimental classes.

Study limitations were that: college students resisted drill techniques; freshmen adjustment to pattern practice was hindered by adjustment to college situation; the staff had to rely on its limited facilities rather than community resources; and the staff had a high turnover rate during the project.

With the help of pattern practice, many students established greater control in the use of standard patterns of English; however, different moods or situations elicited different sets of speech patterns. The students became alert to differences between acceptable and unacceptable usages for the first time. They acquired greater self-confidence and determination for improvement in their dialects, and brought an awareness of the dialect problem to their communities. The experimental group gained more in reading after a year of pattern practice than did the control group, although reading was stressed more in the control group.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION
20. DIVISION OR DEPT.
21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.
22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT
23. DURATION OF PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ERIC

CR 1339

ED002512

PATTERN PRACTICE

IN THE TEACHING OF STANDARD ENGLISH TO STUDENTS WITH A NON-STANDARD DIALECT

BY SAN-SU C. LIN

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

J 0372

PATTERN PRACTICE

IN THE TEACHING OF STANDARD ENGLISH TO STUDENTS WITH A NON-STANDARD DIALECT

BY SAN-SU C. LIN
1965

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
Teachers College - Columbia University

ED002512

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT NUMBER: 1339
BY
SAN-SU C. LIN
1965

THE RESEARCH REPORTED HEREIN WAS SUPPORTED THROUGH THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

PREFACE

This is the final report of the English Project at Claflin University, a three-year research project supported by the Cooperative Research Branch of the U. S. Office of Education under Project English. The Claflin project experimented with the use of pattern practice techniques and materials, both in the classroom and in the language laboratory, to help Southern Negro students who have a dialect background to master standard English.

The research project, which started in September, 1961, and concluded in June, 1964, was a valuable experience for both the students and the teachers concerned. In their struggle for social integration, the students needed help and were appreciative of the unique opportunity afforded by the project. For the teachers, the research brought not only more exacting work, but also much soul-searching thinking and rethinking, resulting in a better understanding of the students and their problems; and a better sense of direction in the teaching-learning endeavor. It has been said that teachers need training in a fourth R--research--in addition to the basic three--reading, writing, and arithmetic. The project staff at Claflin University has been fortunate in having the project to provide such valuable in-service training.

I wish to thank the U. S. Office of Education for its approval and support of the project. Specifically I wish to thank Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston, Acting Chief, Science, Mathematics and Foreign Language Section, Dr. William R. Carriker and Dr. Robert Beezer, Research Co-ordinators, Cooperative Research Program, who were most generous with their encouragement and suggestions at the planning stage of the project. My gratitude also goes to Dr. J. N. Hook, first director of Project English, for his leadership and guidance.

The research project would not have been begun or satisfactorily concluded without the sanction of the administration of Claflin University. In particular I want to thank Dr. H. V. Manning, president, for his guidance and support.

My debts to those who dug deep into the fields of structural linguistics, American dialectology, and the teaching of English are too numerous to mention here. Special acknowledgment should go to Charles C. Fries, who first introduced the use of pattern practice, and to Dr. Aileen Kitchin, who first introduced me to the works of Fries, Kurath, Pike, Trager, Smith and Marckwardt. Others whose works I have drawn upon and whose interest in the project has been most encouraging include Dr. James Squire, Dr. Harold Allen, Dr. Raven McDavid, Dr. Nelson Francis, Dr. A. L. Davis, and Dr. William Labov. I am greatly indebted to all of them.

Dr. Virginia Allen, consultant to the project, first suggested the possibility and the value of this experiment and followed it through from its inception to the conclusion of the final report. Her personal interest in the project has been as inspiring as her knowledge of English usage and her extensive experience in the use of pattern practice in English-as-a-second-language programs, both in this country and abroad.

Another consultant, Dr. Francis Shoemaker, demonstrated how a good teacher could make teaching come alive. With his broad understanding of human relations and his insight into the process of education, he helped the staff see language teaching and learning in the perspective of the humanities. Our statistics consultant, Dr. Rosedith Sitgreaves, has been helpful not only in the development of evaluation procedures and the interpretation of statistical data, but also in her understanding of the problems encountered in the entire project. She has been most patient in helping the staff understand the place of statistics in a research project. All three consultants have read the manuscript of the report and offered innumerable valuable suggestions. My gratitude to them is more than I can express here.

I would also like to thank Dr. Allen Walker Read and Dr. Robert Allen, whose advice on the usage problem has been most illuminating and helpful.

Space does not permit me to mention all members of the Claflin faculty who have helped the project. Special acknowledgment, however, is extended to Mr. Harvey Jenkins, director of audio-visual aids, who volunteered his indispensable service to the language laboratory.

My associates on the project staff should be highly commended for their distinguished work and loyal support of the project. I am greatly indebted to all of them. Special thanks go to Mrs. Julie Wright, who gathered much of the material that appears in the case studies; and to Mrs. Berniece Jenkins, who prepared all the statistical tables, collaborated in the writing of Chapter V and Chapter VI, and proofread the entire manuscript; and to Mrs. Jean Abraham, who efficiently typed all the drafts as well as the final copy of this report.

My students at Claflin University, both the English majors and the project students, deserve many thanks for their fine co-operation and suggestions. Special thanks go to those who volunteered their assistance and those whose works I have included in the appendices.

My most affectionate appreciation goes to my husband, Paul, who never failed to lend his hand and his head whenever I needed help. I would never have accomplished anything without his understanding and encouragement. My appreciation also goes to Betty Lin, my daughter, who helped do some of the proofreading and designed the cover of this report.

San-su C. Lin

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. The Dialect Problem 1
B. Related Research 5
C. The Claflin Project (1961-1964) 7

II. GENERAL DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT 21

A. The First Year (1961-62) 21
B. The Second Year (1962-63) 31
C. The Final Year (1963-64) 34

III. INSTRUCTION AND PRACTICE 40

A. The Language Laboratory 40
B. Pattern Practice in the Classroom 46
C. Small Group Practice and Role Playing 63

IV. EVALUATION PROCEDURES 69

A. The Standardized Test and the Local Test 69
B. The Essay Test 78
C. The Interview 87

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA 98

VI. EXAMPLES OF STUDENT CHANGE 117

Case 1: Connie (Control Group, 1963-64) 119
Case 2: Susan (Experimental Group, 1962-63) 120
Case 3: Alice (Experimental Group, 1963-64) 123
Case 4: Tommy (Experimental Group, 1963-64) 125
Case 5: Roseanne (Experimental Group, 1963-64) 129
Case 6: Willie (Experimental Group, 1963-64) 133

VII. CONCLUSIONS 139

A. Tasks Accomplished 139
B. Limitations of the Project 140
C. The Students' Achievements 142
D. Findings Related to Adaptations of the Pattern Practice Techniques 144
E. Implications for Further Study 146

PAGE

BIBLIOGRAPHY 148

APPENDICES 154

- A. Social Background Questionnaire 154
- B. Samples of Laboratory Lessons 157
- C. Samples of Role Playing Skits Written by Students 176
  - 1. Getting Married 176
  - 2. The Problem of Adjustment 183
  - 3. Father's Consent 186
- D. Local Grammar Test 191
  - 1. Master Form 191
  - 2. Form Used in May, 1964 199
- E. Guide to the Use of the Check List for the Evaluation of the Essay Test 202
- F. An Example of Essay Evaluation 204
  - 1. An Initial Essay 204
  - 2. A Final Essay 205
  - 3. Evaluation Check List for Essay Test 206
- G. An Example of Interview Evaluation 207
  - 1. An Initial Interview 207
  - 2. A Final Interview 214
  - 3. Evaluation Check List for Oral Interviews 220

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A. The Dialect Problem

In the United States, social dialects are not confined to certain geographical regions: There are socially accepted Southern dialects as well as socially accepted Northern dialects; and there are dialects in all sections of the country that are regarded as socially unacceptable or nonstandard. These characterize certain socially or culturally isolated, underprivileged minority groups. The fact that these people have no difficulty making themselves understood (among themselves or when addressing speakers of a standard dialect), or that many of their dialectal features are actually vestiges of earlier forms of English used by Shakespeare or Chaucer, does not make these dialects more acceptable today. The stigma of the speakers' social status is enough to color their dialect as unacceptable, and the dialect in turn brands the individual as undesirable or unfit for the community of the status quo. Thus changing the dialect patterns becomes a serious concern of those who were born into a "nonstandard" dialectal community, if they have the ambition to lift themselves out of their limited environment with its limited opportunities. It also presents a challenge to English teachers who are responsible for helping them to accomplish the task.

The task of changing dialect patterns, unfortunately, is complicated by a failure to recognize the problem for what it is. Many people, both teachers and laymen, brand a social dialect summarily as "bad English" or "bad grammar," and they regard those who use the dialect as people who do not know any better. To such critics, the use of a nonstandard dialect implies an inferior intellect, almost an evidence of original sin. For those who have been exposed to "good English" in school but persist in the use of the local dialect, it means, for the uninformed critic, a kind of hopeless perversity.

We must understand that a nonstandard dialect is neither an intellectual nor a moral problem. Language is not an inborn trait. It is a set of acquired social habits necessary for communication and interaction in a community into which the individual happens to be born. Just as a language, or a dialect, is an integral and inseparable part of a culture or a subculture, an individual's language is so intimately a part of the self that changing his language patterns involves much more than telling him to substitute one usage for another, such as using I don't have anything instead of I ain't got nothing.

What makes a college freshman from a culturally deprived Negro community persist in the use of a nonstandard dialect in spite of many years of English instruction through high school and elementary school? The dialect, no matter how other people may judge it, has evidently proved socially and psychologically satisfactory to the individual who uses it. It is the language of his family--a symbol of security and love. It is the language of his initiation into life--from the dawn of awareness through successive steps in which he learned to adjust to different groups and to establish rapport with the world around him. Take it away from him, and he will be like Miss Doolittle in G. B. Shaw's play, an individual of no identity.

Yet this is exactly what many teachers attempt to do--to take away his dialect and help him use "good" or correct English. By teaching him "good" English teachers are implying that his dialect is bad, and by over-emphasizing right or wrong, correctness or incorrectness, they are introducing a moral issue which adds to the student's feelings of anxiety and guilt.

This does not mean, of course, that the student should be left alone with his nonstandard dialect. The schools and colleges must assume responsibility for enabling the young to meet the standards imposed by the society; and the individual, not to be penalized, must learn to behave in accordance with the accepted social norms in the use of language as in other matters. But the teacher must himself understand, and help the student understand, what is involved in the task.

First of all, the teacher must become aware, and help the student become aware, of the infinite variations that exist in the many dialects of American English, both regional and social. Both teacher and student must also understand the social implications of these variations. If any change is desirable, the decision to change must come from the individual himself. The teacher, with sympathetic understanding, can help speed the process of change by supplying the necessary methods and materials.

It is more realistic, as well as more psychologically sound, to consider this change not as the substitution of standard English for a nonstandard dialect, but as the acquisition of a second language in addition to the individual's first language, which is his own dialect. Stated in another way, the teacher and the student should consider the change of dialect patterns a process of growth from one language (the local dialect) and one style of speaking and writing (the homely style) to more sensitivity and versatility in the use of language. The individual will then be better equipped to make appropriate linguistic responses as he makes more varied social contacts and finds himself in a variety of situations other than his immediate circles of family and peer-group friends. Built on the concept of growth and progressive social adjustment, a standard English program is less likely to be resisted by the culturally different youth.

Even when the individual is perfectly willing to achieve proficiency in the use of standard English, he must have a program specially designed to meet his needs if his effort is not to be frustrated.

Unfortunately, the English programs embodied in many textbooks and used in many schools are not equal to the task. In spite of conceivable social upheaval in the wake of accelerating technological development, in spite of new information and new theories uncovered by diligent research workers in the diverse branches of linguistic science, and in spite of the dedicated leadership of the NCTE in bringing research findings into the English classroom, English instruction in the schools and colleges remains very much as it was half a century ago. As recently as 1957, Robert C. Pooley reported that "...in the teaching of English there is a considerable lag in practice behind the findings of research and the recommendations of expert teachers. The great majority of teachers tend to continue teaching what they have been taught and by the same method."[1]

---

[1] Robert C. Pooley, Teaching English Grammar, p. 33.

Concern for what was widely felt to be the deplorable state of the teaching of English in the United States culminated in a fact finding research reported by James R. Squire and his associates in The National Interest and the Teaching of English in 1961. Both governmental and professional leadership was stirred into action and numerous research and experimental programs have been launched since. The impact, however, has only begun to be felt in the backwaters of the deep South.

For the linguistically different youth, there has been little recognition among English teachers of the need for a program basically different from the English program catering to those who speak standard English at home. Not only are these linguistically different young people more sensitive to intolerance and tactless criticism, they also differ from standard speakers in being faced with the task of establishing a new set of language habits. In other words, if they are learning a second language to be added to their indigenous dialect, they must be taught with methods and procedures that are used in learning a second language.

B. Related Research

Fortunately, if linguistic principles and methods have not been widely used in the teaching of English to the native born, they have been generally accepted in foreign language teaching and in teaching English as a foreign language to foreigners. Charles C. Fries' Cumulative Pattern Practices embodies a linguistic approach used by him and his research staff in an intensive English program for foreign students during World War II. Since then pattern practice techniques, based on structural substitution frames; the audio-lingual approach, based on the primary importance of speech; and the use of the language laboratory for intensive, habit-forming drills have become more or less standard procedures in foreign language teaching.

The application of foreign language techniques in helping native speakers of a variant of Canadian-French to become proficient in "standard" French was attempted by Gerald J. Brault in a summer institute at Bowdoin College in Maine in 1961.

For native speakers of nonstandard English, a pioneer attempt to use pattern practice techniques and materials was made by Marjorie Wescott Barrows in Good English Through Practice. Dr. Barrows devised for junior high school students many games requiring the repetition of certain standard English patterns. The materials, which concentrated heavily on the use of the irregular verbs, had been tested in several high schools and junior high schools before they appeared in a book form.

Two more studies on the high school level were conducted by Ruth I.Golden in the Detroit public school system. The first study, reported in Improving Patterns of Language Usage in 1960, included a questionnaire to decide the frequency of certain nonstandard patterns as high school students of various social backgrounds heard and used them, as well as a program to help these students acquire standard speech. Her second study, reported in Effectiveness of Instructional Tapes for Changing Regional Speech Patterns in 1962, experimented with fourteen 30 minute tapes used in one semester to help tenth-grade students change their regional speech patterns. The fourteen tapes explain to the students the nature of their speech problems and the structural patterns of standard English, and provide repetitious drills at the same time.

Marianne E. Musgrave, in an article "Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Students with Substandard Dialects,"[2] reported an experiment at Alcorn College, Mississippi, in which she used foreign language techniques to help students do individual oral drills. She reported that one student, who really applied himself, developed remarkably in one semester, but she emphasized that students must have the will to improve their speech.

Although extensive research has been completed on regional differences in speech, Marjorie Smiley pointed out, "...there is little analogous research on class differences in language."[3] As reported in Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth published by the U. S. Office of Education in 1962 and Promising Practices in the Teaching of English prepared by NCTE in 1963, most experimental programs are concerned with culturally deprived groups in large urban centers emphasizing reading and writing rather than dialectal usage.

C. The Claflin Project (1961-1964)

The Claflin Project, entitled "Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Nonstandard Dialect," used techniques similar to those that had been developed by Fries and widely adopted in English-as-a-foreign-language programs as well as other foreign language programs. However, adaptations had to be made, since standard English, though it may be a second language to some native born Americans who speak a nonstandard dialect, is not a foreign language. Not only will it cause psychological difficulty to term one's national language a foreign tongue, the practical problems involved in the two situations are not entirely the same. The interference between two closely related dialects--such as a nonstandard dialect and standard English--is far greater than between two completely different languages, and the socially significant differences between the standard and nonstandard forms may be overshadowed by the similarities and fail to present a real challenge to the students.[4]

---

[2] Marianne E. Musgrave, "Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Students with Substandard Dialects" CLA Journal, September, 1963, pp. 84-91.

[3] Marjorie Smiley, "Research and Its Implications" Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth (U. S. Department of Education, 1962), p. 37.

The purpose of the project, therefore, was to find out to what extent pattern practice techniques might help Negro students who needed to master standard English as a second language, and to work out materials and procedures to implement such techniques. The Claflin project differed in two ways from other research studies on culturally different youth discussed above. It experimented with college freshmen instead of high school students, and it dealt with the dialect problem of Negro youth from rural communities in the deep South rather than with a similar problem found in the slum areas of big urban centers in the North. At Claflin, even when a student said that he came from Charleston or some other big city in South Carolina, it often turned out that he meant some rural area in that general direction, perhaps ten or twenty miles from the city itself. Unlike many Americans, these students had stayed almost all their lives in a highly homogeneous community. Some were not really aware of their dialectal problem since they had not often been exposed to standard English.

---

[4] See Chapter III: "Instruction and Practice" for a more detailed discussion of adaptations in pattern practice techniques which were necessitated by differences between "second language" and "second dialect" teaching.

In the Claflin project, no attempt was made to analyze the grammar or the sounds of the students' dialect systematically, since the staff members were functioning as teachers, not linguistic scientists. The dialect patterns, however, were studied in the process of evaluating the students' essays and their interviews, and while observing the students' daily performance in classes and in practice sessions. In other words, the emphasis of the study was on the students' awareness and control of standard patterns rather than on a description of the dialect as it was used by the students in their homes.

The College--Claflin College, chartered as Claflin University in its founding year of 1869, is a Methodist-supported four-year college for Negro youth, with an enrollment slightly under 500.

Located in the city of Orangeburg, almost in the center of South Carolina, it draws its student body primarily from South Carolina, with a small number from Georgia, Florida, North Carolina Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. There have been a few from Hawaii, the Philippines, and South America.

Traditionally a liberal arts college, Claflin has approximately 80 per cent of its students preparing for the teaching profession. Others plan to join the civil services, the armed forces, the ministry, or to become social workers, technicians, or businessmen. Very few plan to go directly to graduate school. Many have to work during the summer or even during the school year to see themselves through college. Some have said that, even with a scholarship or loan, they would probably not be able to go on to graduate school immediately after graduation, since they felt obligated to help a younger sister or brother through college.

With a charter proclaiming that no instructor or student shall be refused and denied on account of race, complexion, or religion, Claflin College is proud of its integrated and international faculty, which consists of Negroes, a few American whites, Canadians, Chinese, Filipinos, and Cubans. There have been no white members in the student body except in the summer science institute of 1964.

Claflin College is one of two private, senior colleges existing historically for Negro youth in South Carolina that have been awarded full membership to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools since this accrediting agency abolished its dual standard for Negro and white institutions in 1956. Claflin has also been the recipient of grants from the Ford Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, the Southern Education Foundation, the United States Steel Foundation, and the C. I. T. Foundation, in addition to the National Science Foundation for four summer science institutes in five years, as well as a three year grant from the U. S. Office of Education which has made this experiment possible.

The Project Students--Approximately 65-70 freshmen were selected each year to be placed in four project sections. Selection was based on test scores and the project group was the average group in the entire freshman English class.

All of the project students are American Negroes, both male and female. Most were born, reared, and educated in the segregated public school systems in various parts of South Carolina. According to a questionnaire filled out anonymously by the project students of 1963-64, only six among sixty students were born outside

South Carolina: one in Georgia, two in Florida, and three in New York City.

According to the same questionnaire, all of the 26 male and 34 female project students in 1963-64 were born between 1942-46, with the majority (34) born in 1945. Most of the families from which these students came have four to eight members each, consisting primarily of parents and siblings. Six families were fatherless, and one motherless, because of death. The parents are separated in four families, and divorced in two, but an overwhelming majority, 47 out of 60 families, have parents living together.

In education, one or both of the parents finished college in twelve families and went beyond college in five families. In eight families, one or both of the parents finished high school, while in nine more they attended high school but did not graduate. In seven families, they never went beyond junior high school; and in two, not beyond sixth grade. Four students did not answer this item. As for the education of siblings, thirteen students had siblings in college, thirteen had siblings working after college graduation, and thirteen more had siblings working after high school graduation.

The father was the sole breadwinner in 22 families; the mother, in three; and the grandmother, in one. In 23 other families, both parents worked. In nine others, a grandfather, grandmother, brother, or sister, contributed to the family support. Two students left this item unanswered.

Family incomes were as follows: 16 families had an income of \$3,000 or under; 11 earned \$3,001-5,000; 8 earned \$5,001-7,500; 2 earned \$7,501-10,000; 4 earned above \$10,000; and 19 students left the item unanswered.[5]

---

[5] The project staff believes that many students honestly did not know the answer to this item.

Types of occupations engaged in by the father or the grandfather of the family included school principal, minister, merchant, self-employed, military serviceman, naval base employee, city employee, drug store attendant, grocer, baker, yardman, tile-setter, brick mason, construction worker, lumber worker (one of each), cooks (2), motel workers (2), carpenters (4), common laborers (4), farmers (5), and factory workers (8). Thirteen students indicated that the father or grandfather worked but did not specify the occupations.

Occupations for the mother or the grandmother included housewives (6), school teachers (5), domestic workers (5), nurses (2), social worker, librarian, beautician, florist, night-club manager, dress shop employee, school bus driver, laundry worker, farm worker, factory worker, and waitress (one of each). Ten students did not specify.

Thirty-six students had their tuition paid by the parents, three by an older sibling, three by themselves, two by scholarship funds, one by government loan, and seven by parents and government loan. Nine others had to use a combination of various resources.

Fourteen students had to work during the school year, 42 had to work during the previous summer, while 23 anticipated financial difficulties in getting through college.

Asked whether they anticipated going to graduate school, six students answered a flat "no"; ten said "yes" because their families intended to send them; five would go immediately after college graduation if they could get a scholarship; the majority (36) said they would go, but would get a job first.

Fifty-three students had traveled at least once outside the state of South Carolina; seven did not answer the question. Most of them had visited, in descending order, New York, Washington, D. C., Georgia, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland for the purpose of visiting relatives, getting jobs, or just vacationing. One student had visited Japan and South Korea while in the army.

Seven students said they had less than 25 books in the family, six more had less than 50, and thirteen more had under 100, eleven had 101-200; seven, 301-500; and two, over 1,000. Fourteen did not answer this item.

Most families subscribed to two to seven periodicals, and most students read two to four periodicals regularly, and two or three more occasionally. Most newspapers subscribed to were hometown local papers, whereas the newspapers most often read by the students included the _State_ (29), _Afro-American_ (17), _New York Times_ (14), and _Times and Democrat_ (local paper of Orangeburg) (13). The magazines most often read were _Life_ (27), _Ebony_ (24), _Time_ (23), _Jet_ (14), _Saturday Evening Post_ (6), _Look_ (5), and _Reader's Digest_ (4).

Nine students had had a major accident, and four had experienced a family catastrophe in their lives. Eighteen had had the experience of hospitalization. Only one had ever joined the Armed Forces. Eight students had never visited a museum.[6] Eighteen students had been arrested, all except one for the reason of racial demonstrations.

---

[6] Many students in the art appreciation class visited the museum in Columbia a month before answering this questionnaire. Otherwise the figure could have been higher.

Fifty students and their families attended church regularly, seven more occasionally. Leisure time was spent primarily in watching T.V. (56), just sitting around and chatting (44), listening to the record player to both classical and popular music (40), reading periodicals (39), reading books, both fiction and nonfiction (38), visiting friends and relatives (37), assisting in church and community activities (30), listening to the radio (28), gardening (24) and sewing (18).[7]

According to the Cooperative English Tests (Reading Comprehension and English Expression), the project students in 1963-64 had a median of 137 when they entered college as compared with the national median of 151.3 for the 12th grade (Spring Testing).

All students included in the project spoke the nonstandard dialect to some extent. However, almost all of them had come a long way toward eliminating some nonstandard patterns from their speech before they came to college. Patterns like I is, you is were seldom heard, though you was was not uncommon. Them boys instead of these boys or those boys, and youse for second person plural were extremely rare, although hisself and theirselves were still used; students generally avoided ain't, perhaps because the word had been cited too often as an example of substandard usage.

Nonstandard patterns still used by project students when they began to take part in the project in September included the double negative (I don't see nobody.), double subject (My father, he is a farmer.), double comparison (My brother is more taller than me.), incorrect pronoun forms (*Between you and I*), uninflected verbs (*He begin*, *he don't*), uninflected plural noun (*three apple*), and the confusion of adjective and adverb (*He sang good*.).

---

[7] No attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of the answers to the questionnaire. Members of the project staff believe that the general picture, if not every single answer, is truthful and reflects what they know about the students.

In pronunciation, some students still used /d/ for /th/ in words like *this* and *that* and many substituted /n/ for /ng/ in words like *along* or *singing*. Final consonants, including grammatical endings, were often dropped. In the pronunciation of some students, *are* sounds like *or*; *were*, like *where*; and *right*, like *rat*; but by and large, the students had little difficulty making themselves understood, particularly when one became used to their accent.

In conclusion, if those in 1963-64 can be used as examples, the freshman students included in the English project at Claflin College are primarily Southern Negroes from generally normal, hard-working, church-going families. The parents, though many of whom are confined to unskilled or semi-skilled jobs, are an ambitious group willing to toil for better opportunities for their children. The young people themselves help to pay their way, or that of a young brother or sister, through college.

In spite of their determination and effort to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, however, these students--victims of a segregated school system and social discrimination, as were, most probably, their teachers before them--were below national norms in language proficiency as measured by standardized test scores, although they compared favorably with other Negro youth in the Deep South. They appeared to be torn between a sense of pride or satisfaction in having come a long way and a deep-seated sense of inadequacy which discrimination has forced on them since early childhood. And their language difficulty, entwined with psychological problems, often baffled both teachers and students.

Still, these students were as intelligent and as eager to learn as any other a teacher could find anywhere else. They spent a total of eight to nine hours each week for a three-hour course, sometimes bored by too much repetition in practice, sometimes frustrated by uncooperative machines, and sometimes upset by a change of procedure to which they had to adjust; but they were always slow to complain and quick to cooperate and show appreciation.

The Project Staff--The chief investigator, San-su C. Lin, received her Ed. D. degree from Teachers College, Columbia University, with a major in "Teaching English as a Second Language." Before she came to the United States in 1949, she spent a year at the graduate school of National Peking University of China with a major in linguistics, two years in field research on a language of a minority group, Hwa Miao, in Southwestern China, and three years teaching English to Chinese students in high school and college. When the project first started in September, 1961, she had been professor of English at Claflin College for six years and head of the English Department for four years. She was particularly interested in applying modern linguistic theories and techniques to the teaching of English. As director of the experiment, she not only took charge of planning and supervision, but actually taught two project classes each year to observe at first hand how students reacted to the methods and materials designed for them.

Dr. Lucy R. Cutliff received her Ed. D. degree from Indiana University under the Danforth Foundation Fellowship Funds. She was professor of education and head of the Education Division at Claflin College. She was responsible for conducting the interviews, working out other methods and procedures of evaluation, and presenting the results in statistical form during the first year of the project. Unfortunately, she left the project (and the college) after the first year.

Mrs. Alethia S. Worthy received her A. B. and M. A. degrees from Howard University, and her further study at New York University amounts to twenty-four hours beyond the master's degree. She is assistant professor of English, director of the reading clinic, and faculty advisor of the dramatics club at Claflin College. With twenty-three years of teaching experience behind her at the initiation of the project, she evaluated the essay test and wrote some of the laboratory lessons during the first year, took over the interviews in the second year, gave reading instruction and directed role-playing activities in the project. Besides the chief investigator, Mrs. Worthy was the only member who served the project throughout the entire three year period.

Mrs. Constance Stinson, who served the project in its second and third years, received her B. S. degree from Barber-Scotia College, her M. A. degree in English from Teachers College, Columbia University, and did further study toward her professional diploma at the same institution. A ninth-grade English teacher in the Burke County public school system in Georgia, Mrs. Stinson worked for the Claflin project on weekends and holidays primarily because of her keen interest in the experiment. She was responsible for administering and scoring tests, evaluating the essay tests and the interviews, and monitoring the tapes made by students in the language laboratory.

Mr. John Walker, who taught two classes in the first year of the project, received his M. S. degree from South Carolina State

College and did further study at the University of Texas. He was also director of public relations during his stay at Claflin College. He left after one year to become a school principal in Florida.

Dr. Arsenia Cabotaje, who succeeded Mr. Walker as teacher of two project classes during the second year of the project, received her Ed. D. degree from American University. Born in the Philippines, she had more than twenty years of experience teaching English, both in the Philippines and in New York State. With her advanced degree in education administration, she joined the Education Department of Claflin after one year with the project.

Mrs. Berniece Jenkins, who replaced Dr. Cabotaje in teaching two project classes in the last year of the project, was also responsible for its statistical work. She did most of her undergraduate work at Wilberforce University and received her A. B. and M. E. degrees in English from South Carolina State College. Mrs. Jenkins was born and reared in Pennsylvania and speaks standard English as her first language. Her receptiveness to new ideas more than compensated for her lack of teaching experience.

Mrs. Jocelyn Jackson, who was language laboratory assistant during the first year of the project, received her B. A. degree in English from Boston University. Besides her regular duties in the language laboratory, she transferred most of the written lessons into oral lessons recorded on tapes. She also recorded her interpretive reading of twelve excerpts from great works of literature, which became a part of the listening program throughout the entire span of the project. Mrs. Jackson left to pursue graduate study at Georgetown University.

Mrs. Mary Thompson, who succeeded Mrs. Jackson as language laboratory assistant in the second year, received her B. A. degree in English from South Carolina State College. She took an evening course in speech and discharged her duties faithfully. She left after seven months of service when her first baby was born.

Mrs. Julie Wright, a Claflin graduate, was laboratory assistant during the last part of the second year and the crucial third year of the project. She had the task of leading group discussions for the control groups and the additional responsibility of conducting the interviews. After her graduation from Claflin College in 1960, Mrs. Wright served as youth field secretary for the NAACP for two and a half years, working with and talking to numerous Negro youths in six southern states in her organizational work, an experience which gave her considerable insight into the language problems as well as the psychology of the young Negroes of her generation.

Original Plan and Revisions--According to the original plan, the first year of the three year experiment would be devoted primarily to the development of procedures and practice materials. Approximately 60 "average" students selected from the freshman English class would be placed in four sections of fifteen each to test these materials. These sections would meet three times a week for 50 minutes each in regular class sessions. In addition, the students would spend six periods a week in laboratory drill.

The second year, which would be the heart of the experiment, would be devoted to testing the revised versions of pattern practice techniques and materials with another group of freshmen similar to the group in the first year. The results of the testing, which would include a standardized test, an essay test, and an oral interview given to each student at the beginning and the end of the year, would be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project.

The third year was to be used to analyze and study statistically the results of the tests, to make further revisions of procedures and materials as suggested by the results of the evaluation, and to prepare the final report.

Many problems could not be foreseen at the planning stage. The first problem, which confronted the staff almost as soon as the project began and continued to be a major problem throughout the three years of the experiment, was how to reduce the subjective essay test and the students' interviews to statistical data. Those in charge of evaluation also felt that scientific evaluation could not be achieved without the comparison of a control group.

Consequently, while the first year was devoted as planned to the development of practice materials, resulting in about 60 language laboratory lessons recorded on tapes as well as the methods and procedures for their use, the second year, while trying out the lessons on a different group of freshmen, was devoted primarily to the development of evaluation devices and procedures which included the designing of a local grammar test, the preparation of a clearly defined checklist for the evaluation of the essay tests and the interviews, and the planning of a better procedure to be used to conduct the essay tests and the interviews during the third year. The third year was used for the final evaluation of the project by dividing four project sections into two control classes and two experimental classes. The major problem during the third year, of course, was that too little time was left for the analysis of statistical data and the preparation of the final report.

CHAPTER II: GENERAL DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

A. The First Year (1961-62)

The first year of the project started in September, 1961, with sixty-five students selected from the freshman class of 166 and placed in four experimental classes of 16-17 each. Selection was based on the scores of the New Purdue Placement Test in English, Form E, and the rating of an essay entitled "My Family." The project students selected were "average" students as compared with the entire freshman class.

These experimental classes, taught by two different instructors, were actually sections of the regular freshman English class--English 101-102: Communication. However, in addition to attending classes three periods a week, as all other freshman English students did, the project students were required to spend six additional hours per week, or one per day, on audio-lingual practice in the language laboratory without extra credit. These six hours of practice were conceived as supervised "homework," and the students received no other assignment except encouragement to read during their leisure time.

The project students were also required to have a personal interview with a designated member of the project staff at the beginning of the year's program. Everybody on the project staff knew that the purpose of the interview was to find out how the students talked, with particular reference to the nonstandard dialectal patterns. Although that sounded quite simple at the beginning, suddenly the staff found that they were not at all clear, at least they could not agree, as to what "dialect" meant. Some insisted that nonstandard dialect meant primarily the pronunciation, and the purpose of the interview was to find out how many words a student would mispronounce, or what words the students were most likely to mispronounce. Others believed that dialect was a matter of grammar, or "bad" grammar which did not conform to the rules. It was only after much discussion that this crucial question was clarified, and the staff decided to adhere to the following points in evaluation and instruction:

1. Nonstandard dialectal patterns, for the purpose of the experiment, should mean patterns of grammatical usage not found in standard English.
2. Usages acceptable in standard colloquial English are not nonstandard or dialectal even if they run contrary to grammatical rules.
3. Although correct pronunciation is a primary concern of the English teacher, neither mispronunciation of some words by some students nor the use of the Southern accent constitutes a dialectal problem. Problems of pronunciation that can be considered dialectal are a) failure to pronounce grammatical endings such as the s or the ed, and b) substitution of the /d/ phoneme for the initial phoneme in words like this and that. These were considered to be within the scope of the project because such mispronunciations

are socially unacceptable throughout the United States. Another confusion of phonemes, /n/ for /ng/, considered substandard by some but regional by others, should receive attention in instruction, but not in evaluation.

4. Pronunciation should definitely be taught in an English class, but, except when it is directly related to grammatical patterns, it should not occupy the center of attention in the evaluation of the project.

In the meantime, the students' essays written for the September, 1962, essay test had also been studied together with the students' usages in speech, and a priority list of patterns to be practiced was worked out. The usages that were judged to be clearly nonstandard, those that occurred most frequently in the students' daily speech, and those that had the widest application received prior attention. For example, the verb was found to have caused the greatest difficulty to students who were used to "breaking the verb;"[8] it was also considered the most important because it is indispensable in every sentence; thus verb patterns were given priority over all other patterns. Among verb patterns, the patterns with the verbs _be_, _have_, and _do_ and their various forms have higher frequency than any other verbs, and they received primary attention over other verbs. Next came the regular verbs with the _ed_ ending. They may not be as difficult as the irregular verbs, but regular final inflections definitely have wider application than internal vowel changes in modern English grammar. On the lower end of the priority list were usages not conforming to grammatical rules but considered acceptable in colloquial English, such as the use of who for whom, the use of like for as as a conjunction, etc. These disputed usages were discussed in connection with writing, but the "correct" patterns were not scheduled for oral practice.

---

[8] "Breaking the verb," probably derived from "broken English," is an expression used by students to refer to nonstandard usage of verbs or verb phrases.

With the priority list as guide, about 60 laboratory lessons were written and arranged in sets of four. A basic series emphasizes the basic patterns, using relatively short sentences and familiar vocabulary items so that the pattern in question can stand out most clearly. A lesson usually contains two parts. Part I contains sentences to be repeated after the instructor. Part II contains questions calling for answers which require the use of the patterns practiced in Part I. A supplementary series contains more information while providing review for the patterns already practiced in the basic series. Some lessons permit longer and freer responses. Others are in the form of dialog or role-playing skits.

As soon as the lessons were written, the laboratory assistant would record them on a master tape, which was then duplicated into as many tapes as the students would need. The recording was a difficult task for one without extensive speech training. The laboratory assistant who did most of the recording during the first year had a firm, well pitched voice and extraordinarily good enunciation.

Still, when she spoke naturally into the recorder, the ed or the s endings were not always clearly audible on the first generation tapes (the master tapes), and often vanished on the second generation tapes (the duplicate tapes). When she tried to pronounce every word as distinctly as possible, both the phrasing and the intonation became slightly distorted or unnatural. The pacing of the utterances and of the pauses was likely to be either too fast or too slow for the students and took much experimenting to reach a happy medium. Often the lessons themselves had to be rewritten to meet the time limit on the tape. All this work, seemingly trivial, was time consuming, and to have enough lessons ready for the students to practice six days a week became the greatest challenge to the project staff during the first year.

During the practice sessions in the language laboratory, a student would use a tape every week. Each tape contained a set of four lessons concentrating on a grammatical pattern or a few related patterns. Using a dual-track tape recorder at his own booth, the student would listen to the instructor's model sentences recorded on the first track, and repeat the sentence when the instructor paused; his repetition was recorded on the second track. When he played back the tape, he could hear his own sentence after the instructor's model and could, by comparison, judge his own performance. If he was not satisfied, he could record again, and the second recording would automatically erase the first. The instructor's voice on the first track, however, could never be erased by the student, and the same tape could be used again and again.

The recording usually lasted about 12 minutes, and 12 more minutes were allowed for rewinding, reviewing, and revision. Four lessons on one tape usually took about four days for the students to record, leaving the other two days of the week for re-recording, if necessary, and general review. During the general review periods, students were usually paired off to listen to each other's tapes and to call attention to each other's difficulties.

After a half hour, the students who had finished recording made way for others who had been waiting their turns at the booths. They would move on to a listening place for the next twenty-five minutes to listen to some review sentences or short paragraphs and write down the dictation. In this way writing was used as a reinforcement for patterns already practiced orally. Sometimes, for a change, they would also listen to oral interpretations of great works of world literature, or Bergen Evans' vocabulary records, or some good literary or speech records which, in addition to the information and enjoyment they provided, served as models of standard English and good speech.

The laboratory assistant, assisted by a senior English major, would monitor the students' recordings and correct their dictation papers. Mistakes in both grammar and pronunciation most often made and uncorrected were called to the attention of both the instructors and the students. The instructors themselves visited the laboratory sessions and checked the tapes from time to time, and students who had difficulty adjusting to the program were given special help by the instructor or the assistant.

In the classroom, in addition to introducing and explaining the grammatical patterns before they were practiced in the language laboratory, and reenforcing them both in speaking and in writing afterward , the instructors sought to develop in the students a sound understanding of the nature of language and language learning and an objective or detached attitude toward their dialect problems. Students observed and discussed how the English language changed in time and place, using examples from Shakespeare and the King James Bible to illustrate the former and the students' own knowledge of regional variations in vocabulary and pronunciation to substantiate the latter. They went on to distinguish spoken English from written English, noting their differences and their relationships. This discussion was most fruitful as an introduction to an English course since it led naturally to the relationship between pronunciation and spelling and the relationship between intonation, pauses, punctuation, and sentence structure. The difference between writing style and colloquial style also led to the concept of levels of usage and the social and arbitrary nature of both standard English and the local dialect. Students were intrigued to learn that "bad English" such as the double negative or "the most beautifullest" or "you was" was once perfectly good usage, and that people who used these expressions in modern times were simply old-fashioned rather than incorrect. They also came to realize that language difficulties often stemmed from poor habits or poor attitudes rather than inferior intelligence, that indifference on the one hand and over-anxiety causing inhibition on the other could be equally detrimental to one's language performance, and that the habit of using standard English could only be established by persistent practice. Standard English, however, did not have to replace the local dialect, any more than a new dress or suit had to replace the old. They could be used side by side for different occasions.

To help students apply these concepts in coping with the language and the people around them, an open questionnaire was given to the students with these questions to answer:

1. Did people criticize you when you made "mistakes" in grammar? If so, what kind of people did?
2. Did people criticize you when you used "correct grammar" in their midst? If so, what kind of people did?
3. If you use correct grammar at home, will your parents be pleased or displeased? For what reasons?
4. Do you feel very self-conscious when you use good English in a group that does not?
5. Do you put on airs when you use good English? Or do people think that you do even though you think you don't?
6. Did you ever correct your friends when they used incorrect grammar? If so, what was their reaction?
7. Did you ever correct your parents or elders when they used incorrect grammar? If so, what was their reaction?
8. Do you think you should correct people when they use incorrect grammar? Why or why not?
9. Do you have to make an effort to use good English when you are in a situation that calls for it? Or can you do it naturally without difficulty?

10. Do you think a person should use good English among people who don't? Or should he go along with the group?

11. Do you think a person can shift easily from dialect to good English and back as he associates with different groups in his everyday life?

12. Do you think more students speak standard English or dialect in the dormitory and the dining hall? Why?

Almost all students conceded that they were criticized when they made mistakes in grammar, mostly by a teacher, sometimes by an older brother, or sister, or some relatives, only rarely by a parent. Almost half said that they were criticized for using correct grammar, mostly by people who did not speak correctly, and unaccountably, sometimes even by a teacher or a parent. Still, almost all students answered that their parents were pleased when they used "correct grammar."

An overwhelming majority believed that a person should use good English even among people who did not, although they also observed that more students spoke the local dialect in the dormitories and the dining hall. Many admitted that they had to make an effort to use good English in a situation that called for it. Almost half of the students believed a person could shift easily from dialect to good English and back as he associated with different groups. The other half were not so certain or thought it would be very difficult.

The purpose of the questionnaire, however, was to help a student observe and reflect on the speech of the people around him and the effect his own speech had on other people. It was to help him size up his environment, as well as clarify his own thinking toward language usage. In the discussion that followed the questions, students disagreed most strongly on two items: whether one should follow the crowd or insist on what was right; and whether one should correct people when one believed they were wrong. The conclusion was that one could be different without being offensive, particularly if one could speak standard English without too much self-consciousness and without throwing in too many big words that had no place in everyday conversations. As for correcting others, many sensibly advised caution. One student remarked, perhaps realistically, "If you do, you have to correct people all the time."

Still, it would be good to alert oneself to the difference between the dialect and standard English, and to habituate oneself to the use of the latter, particularly on a college campus. If project students should refrain from correcting other people, they nevertheless agreed to correct each other and to learn to accept corrections graciously.

Few students, however, attempted to use standard English outside the classroom, not only because they were concerned with peer approval, but also because the habit of using the dialect among themselves was too deeply rooted to change, and to speak the dialect was "so comfortable and relaxing," particularly "after all the strain in the classroom."

The nine-month period was cut short for many students who dropped out of school in January for various reasons, and the project was left with 45 students regrouped in three sections in the second semester. When the final tests were given at the end of March, 1962, to permit sufficient time to evaluate test results, these 45 students showed significant gains on both the Purdue Test and the essay test. The initial and the final interviews, however, were not studied because they were not considered comparable on account of radical changes in emphasis and procedure, and the staff felt that they needed to further develop or refine the entire evaluation procedure for the second year and to postpone final evaluation to the third year when control classes would be set up to match the experimental classes.

B. The Second Year (1962-63)

The second year of the project started in September, 1962, with 68 freshmen and ended with 62 freshmen in May, 1963. This group, slightly below average as compared with the entire freshman class of around 150 students, was again divided into four experimental sections under two different instructors. For placement and evaluation, the New Cooperative English Tests, both Reading Comprehension and English Expression, Form 2A, were used instead of the Purdue English Test, and a locally devised grammar test and spelling test were also used in addition to the essay test. The local grammar test was designed to measure the kind of usage patterns with which the students had the greatest difficulty. Its reliability was established by a high correlation with the other tests as well as between its sub-tests. The procedure of evaluating the essay test was also refined. Instead of lumping all errors together to yield a number of errors per hundred words for each essay, grammatical and mechanical errors were carefully separated and classified under clearly defined categories. The numbers of grammatical errors per hundred words for the essays were then correlated with scores on the local grammar test as well as the Cooperative English Expression Test.

The personal interviews for project students were conducted in an entirely different manner. Instead of asking students to read and to discuss the contents of a passage or asking them a prepared set or alternate sets of questions, an individual approach was used in an attempt to bring about a more congenial relationship and elicit a more natural conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee.

Procedure in the language laboratory remained very much the same except for a few minor changes. Practice time was reduced from six hours to five hours a week, releasing the students on Saturdays. Some lessons were revised, some discarded and others added. Reading replaced listening or dictation to take up the 25 minutes when the students were waiting for their turns at the booths or when they had finished recording during the practice sessions. Six class periods were set aside at the beginning of the year to give the students some instruction or orientation in effective reading. Reading films were used to demonstrate phrase reading, and the SRA Reading

Laboratory was used to provide daily reading practice. Although reading was not a focal point of the project, the staff felt that it was not only a significant communication skill to be cultivated, but also a means of exposing the students to standard English.

In the classroom, similar discussions and the same questionnaire were used as in the first year to help students understand their language problems and the nature of language learning.

Better coordination was worked out between classroom instruction and laboratory practice, and an integrated program gradually emerged. Role-playing activities were tried and found effective in motivating students in the use of standard English. Students wrote their own skits and made their own sentences for pattern practice, which proved to be more meaningful than repeating sentences in the lessons prepared for them.

The students showed significant gains on all the terminal tests given in May, 1963. Only 49 final interviews were completed at the close of the year because of resistance on the part of some students; in addition, the change of tests and testing, interviewing, and evaluation procedures made it impossible to compare the students' achievement in both the first and second years. Nevertheless, the staff felt increasing confidence in the experiment and everything seemed to be ready for the final evaluation which was to take place in the third year.

C. The Final Year (1963-64)

The third and final year of the project was the crucial experimental year with two control classes set up against two experimental classes. Seventy-one students were selected from the freshman class of 144 on the same bases as in the previous year, namely, the Cooperative English Tests, both English Expression and Reading, the local grammar and spelling tests, and the essay test. These students were then placed at random in four sections, B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4, with 17-18 students each. B-1 and B-2 were designated as the experimental groups; B-3 and B-4, the control groups. To avoid misinterpretation or stigma attached to either group, the terms "experimental" and "control" were avoided. Instead, the experimental program was referred to as Program I, whereas the control program was referred to as Program II.

To put the two programs on a comparable basis, it was decided that the same amount of time should be allotted each week to both programs, using a placebo treatment in Program II for pattern practice in Program I. In other words, students in both programs were required to attend "laboratory sessions" one period per day, or five periods per week, in addition to three regular class periods for the communication course. Each of the two instructors taught one class in Program I and one class in Program II, while the same laboratory assistant supervised all laboratory sessions. The two programs were designed to be the same except for one variable: pattern practice, which was withheld from Program II.

Both programs started the laboratory sessions during the last week of September after all the initial interviews were completed. For Program I each section was divided into two sub-groups. While students in one sub-group used the tape recorders to record pattern practice lessons in the language laboratory, the other sub-group spent their time reading, writing, listening to literary records or vocabulary recordings, or preparing their lessons independently when it was not their turn to work with the tape recorders. Program II also emphasized oral English and clear speech, and students were told to use standard English in speaking and to correct one another when they made mistakes. The emphasis, however, was on group discussion instead of pattern practice. Subjects for discussion were based on current events (which at that time were dominated by racial conflicts in Orangeburg and other southern cities), newspaper or magazine articles, books read by the students, discussions in the English class or other classes, or speeches made in weekly chapel programs. The discussions were sometimes followed up by writing. Program II students were also permitted to share all the listening lessons, both on tapes and on phonograph records, given to Program I students. These included twelve taped lessons entitled "Introduction to the Great Works of Literature," taped lessons concerning the use of certain homonyms in context, both prepared by the project staff, Bergen Evans' vocabulary records, and other speech and literary records which are models of standard English and good enunciation.

In addition, students in Program II were required to give oral reports of the books they read during laboratory sessions. Vocabulary flash cards were also used to give the program greater variety.

In spite of an enriched program, Program II students, who had assumed that all project students had the privilege of using the machinery in the language laboratory, were bitterly disappointed when they discovered that their so-called laboratory sessions never involved individual recording. Their demands to be allowed to use the booths for recording became so vocal that the project staff felt they could no longer be ignored. On the other hand, the dynamic group discussions in Program II, when students could express themselves freely and enjoyed the attention of both the laboratory assistant and their peers, were so attractive to Program I students that repetitive drills in an isolated booth became very boring and uninspiring. It was a case of seeing the grass greener on the other side of the river. Still, for the sake of student morale, the staff had to meet the challenge with some kind of solution instead of mere explanation.

As a result, procedures in the laboratory sessions for both groups had to be changed in mid-October, 1963. Program II students (the control group) were permitted to use the language laboratory recording facilities once or twice a week to practice public speaking or interpretive reading, or to record their own compositions orally in order to be able to hear them and better able to revise them. Program I students, on the other hand, were permitted to do less recording. Instead, some of their practice sessions were used for small group practice supervised by the laboratory assistant, who followed the sequence that had been set up for the pattern practice lessons but also permitted the students to use their own sentences as long as these sentences conformed to the pattern being practiced.

It was interesting to note that Program II students, as soon as they had learned to operate the tape recorder and had had a chance to listen to their own voices a few times, soon lost interest in the novelty and became more contented with their group discussions. Program I students, on the other hand, liked the small-group practice so much that some refused to leave at the end of the 25 minutes, but stayed on with the next group. Nobody complained, as students had before, that pattern practice was boring.

Because role playing tried out in the second year proved to be promising in motivating students to use standard English, it was decided that its potentialities should be further explored in the third year. Laboratory sessions in the second semester for both Program I and Program II, it was decided, should be devoted exclusively to role-playing activities, and pattern practice for Program I (the experimental group) should be incorporated into the writing and practicing of the skit. The problem was that students soon became more involved in developing and acting out the skits than in paying close attention to language usage. Students who liked dramatics dominated the scene while others who could have been benefited by more pattern practice simply sat back and relaxed.

The reading program for both Program I and Program II students remained very much the same. It differed from the reading program of the previous year in one respect. Instead of using the SRA Reading Laboratory, books with various degrees of readability were placed on shelves for students to browse through. They included many stories of success of famous personalities, both whites and Negroes. Many were high-interest low readability books which contained conversations or narratives in simple, colloquial standard English. Others were selected with special consideration for the students' cultural background or special interests. On the whole, students seemed to enjoy reading more in the third year than in the second year.

In the classroom both Program I and Program II students received similar instruction except for pattern practice. Program II students (the control group) discussed the problems of language mastery, the role of attitude and habit in the use of language, and the structures of English, just as the experimental group did. As a result, students in Program II became as much aware of their language problems as did those in Program I.

A new procedure was used for both the essay test and the interviews during the third year. A short narrative film, which was discussed briefly both before and after its showing, was used as the basis for the essay test. Three pictures from old magazines representing three areas of human experiences: art, natural phenomena, and human relations or activities, provided topics for discussion in the interviews. These audio-visual aids proved invaluable in controlling the content of student's speech and writing as well as suggesting "ideas" that were neither too abstract nor too personal for discussion.

The language laboratory assistant, who was the interviewer for the final year, was better able than the instructors to establish rapport with the students; and all interviews, both initial and final, took place smoothly as scheduled.

With the final testing given on May 5-6, 1964, about ten days before the final examinations of the school year, the experiment with the students concluded and the staff was left to review their work and to determine as objectively as they could what the experiment had accomplished.

CHAPTER III: INSTRUCTION AND PRACTICE

A. The Language Laboratory

The language laboratory, with its paraphernalia of individual booths, tape recorders, headsets, microphones, and program sources, has become so widely used in foreign language programs that its value can hardly be questioned. Although Raymond F. Keating, in a research study based on more than 5,000 students of French in 21 school districts, found that test results favored students in classes that were fully teacher taught, he nevertheless conceded that language laboratories were effective in developing speech production in the first year of foreign language instruction.[9] While nobody would believe that any machine could supplant the teacher, it seems to be the general opinion of language teachers that, properly used, the electronic and mechanical equipment in a modern language laboratory can be a valuable teaching aid. In a foreign language program, the language laboratory enables the student to hear the actual speech and pronunciation of a native speaker when none is present in the student's immediate environment. It can, in addition, provide a variety of voices and, through different speakers, afford the student some experience in distinguishing between significant and nonsignificant variations in the pronunciation. The language laboratory also permits individual audio-lingual practice in the privacy of a sound-proof booth, thus minimizing the self-consciousness which one feels when struggling awkwardly to master a new language. A student can always turn back the tape to listen and repeat one more time or many more times; the instructor's voice over the tape recorder is always calm and even, never showing a trace of impatience or a change in intonation as a teacher might in a classroom situation. Finally, it is believed that only repetitious practice imitating model sentences can bring about firm neuro-muscular control and the habit of using the new language patterns at the appropriate moment. While the instructor with his limited time cannot coach each individual student simultaneously, his voice (or some model voice) can be duplicated on tapes so that the teacher's role can be delegated to the machines in the practice sessions if not in the instructional sessions.

---

[9] Raymond F. Keating, A Study of the Effectiveness of Language Laboratories (New York: Institute of Administrative Research, 1963), pp. vii-viii and p. 39.

For a student who is used to a nonstandard dialect, mastering standard English is not exactly the same as learning a foreign language, and the language laboratory used in a standard English program (or a second dialect program) presents many problems of its own. For one thing, a person learning a foreign language begins with a clean slate. Nobody needs to convince him that he is learning something new. The mastery of each word, each phrase, is challenging, consequently rewarding. In a standard English program, the difference between the standard dialect and the local dialect does not seem significant enough to the students to present a challenge. Of course the project students were greatly excited, initially, about the novel experience of using a tape recorder and listening to their own voices recorded on tape, but as soon as the novelty wore off, which did not take very long, many students confessed that laboratory practice could be "very boring at times." Putting through a standard English program on the college level, it seems, requires more ingenuity than the machine can provide.

Realizing this difficulty, staff members tried different ways to make the laboratory lessons more interesting and meaningful. Some lessons gave information about etiquette. Others used information on communication skills or in other subject matter fields. Still others attempted to create or re-create a life situation in which a student might find himself--talking to an advisor at registration time, job-hunting interviews, etc.[10] Still, these lessons, as practice lessons, were limited in many ways. Concentrating on one structural pattern at a time, these lessons were by nature repetitious and not always natural. Moreover, because of the evanescent nature of sounds, the sentences could neither be too long nor too complicated if the student was expected to repeat them verbatim, with all the words and endings clear and correct. When the model sentence was too long, the student was likely to forget the first part by the time he finished listening to the entire sentence; and since he could remember the content of the model sentence, and he was quite used to expressing ideas in his own words, he would approximate the model sentence instead of rewinding the tape to get every word, thus defeating the purpose of the controlled practice. On the other hand, shorter sentences which presented little difficulty were "too elementary" to bother with. In a group of 60, what was too difficult for some might be too easy for others, or sentences with the same length might become too easy or too difficult when the subject matter changed. Thus much of the effort of the staff was expanded in tailoring the sentences to proper length so that they would neither frustrate nor bore.

---

[10] For samples of laboratory lessons, see Appendix B.

More serious difficulties in the use of the language laboratory arise from the nature of laboratory approach and procedure accentuated by psychological factors characteristic of dialectal groups.

The first crucial factor in any audio-lingual practice is the ear. Unless the ear can hear correctly, oral practice can do more harm than good because, when the wrong thing is repeated, the wrong habit is reenforced. A human being does not hear or see every sound or sight in the outside world. His senses are highly selective, and he hears or sees only what is meaningful to him. If the grammatical concepts of noun plural and verb tense do not exist in a student's dialect, or are manifested differently in that dialect, it is not likely that he is aware of the sound segments that signify these concepts. According to our experience, a student simply did not see the s and ed endings printed in black and white when he was asked to read aloud a paragraph in the textbook; and, after several months of practice with the tape recorder, we sometimes found him conscientiously repeating "Johnny begin to read" when the model voice clearly said "Johnny begins to read." To plead with him to listen carefully was useless. Many teachers had done that and still complained of the inability of the students to follow simple instructions. Some teachers blamed repetitious radio and T.V. advertising for this kind of inattention. Others blamed the high school or elementary school. Probably the entire social background of these students was not conducive to good listening.[11] A student in this situation, therefore, must be trained intensively to listen to and to hear significant sound segments in a word, particularly those representing important grammatical concepts and devices in standard English, so that these concepts actually sink into his consciousness and, in turn, sharpen his perception. Until then, any audio-lingual practice can only reenforce dialectal habits instead of cultivating new habits leading to the mastery of standard English.

---

[11] Doubtless other and more valid explanations would emerge from a scientific analysis of the local dialect as compared with standard English, but such an analysis is beyond the scope of this project.

Secondly, since the student's immediate environment did not require the use of standard English, and the reward for using standard English had come over many years primarily in the form of teacher approval in the English classroom, the language laboratory seemed to have deprived him of the chief source of satisfaction which he expected in the use of "good" English. Some students were not accustomed to doing sustained, independent work that requires a high degree of concentration. Many needed constant reassurance through the attention and approval of teachers or peers. Of course the teacher or the laboratory assistant would eventually listen to the tapes and evaluate the student's performance, but since monitoring tapes took more time than grading papers, the teacher's comments lacked the immediacy which would have made them meaningful. For many students, group experiences with active human interaction seemed psychologically more satisfying than individual practice in an isolated booth.

In spite of all these difficulties, both the project staff and the students have reiterated their belief that the language laboratory has played an important role in improving enunciation and establishing habits of better usage. At least it enabled the students to hear concentrated doses of standard speech, and encouraged them to try to imitate standard discourse for several minutes at a time. If in future planning all the difficulties are taken into account and the proper amount and timing of repetitious practice are carefully determined, and if students are taught to appreciate independent work for its intrinsic value, the language laboratory will probably become far more effective than it has been with the present project.

There is also a word of caution for those who contemplate installing a small language laboratory in a small town. Electronic recorders are very delicate instruments which require expert handling. One machine or another is certain to break down at times, which is a relatively minor problem in or around metropolitan areas when expert service is readily available. In a small town, we found that we often had two or three machines idle for weeks or even months before the company's itinerant service man came around to do the repairs. During the first year, which was the year of adjustment as well as the year of warranty, the problem could simply be a loosened wire or a broken drive belt, but local radio or T.V. repair men did not seem able or willing to handle the dual-track recorders. Some said they knew what was wrong but did not have the parts. Others said electronic equipment was too delicate to be sure of the difficulty.

The obtaining of parts presented another grave problem. Electronics is a fast advancing field and some companies do not seem to keep the same model or design very long. With our recorders, we have found it extremely difficult to get replacement parts after the second year, when various parts, including the recording heads, were beginning to wear out. The service company which we finally located in nearby Columbia told us that they could not secure new parts even from the original manufacturing company because of design change.

They had to comb the surplus market to find whatever they could.

We hope this has been an experience uniquely our own, which nobody else needs to share; but if our experience can provide even an ounce of precaution to other people, we think it has been worthwhile to mention it here.

B. Pattern Practice in the Classroom

Most students come to college with an unshakable faith in grammatical rules. Parrot-like repetitions or audio-lingual drills day in and day out are hardly the kind of things they expect from college. They demand something "on a higher level."

Many project students at Claflin simply did not believe that they needed to learn how to talk. Their view of the situation was that they were just "careless" at times, but had no real difficulty in speaking. They wanted to learn how to write, both in terms of composition and in terms of mechanics. Since these students made three to five times as many errors in spelling and other mechanics as in grammar, their desire to "learn to write better" seemed justified.

It was recognized during the first year of the experiment that to engage students in laboratory practice without sufficiently motivating them would not work. If motivation, introduction, and explanation of usage patterns and the follow-up of laboratory work had to be done in the classroom, then how much time would be left for other things, such as reading, writing, mechanics, etc., which must be taken care of in a communication course? And what about grammar? The use of standard English is primarily a matter of usage, and the usages that distinguish standard English from the local dialect are primarily a matter of word forms (noun forms, verb forms, pronoun forms, etc.) or inflection. Should sentence structure, including phrase and clause structure, or a wider range of structural grammar be taught? In short, what could be taken out of a communication course to make way for pattern practice? Could pattern practice be incorporated into other phases of communication skills? What would be the sentence content for pattern practice?

Although attacking the dialect problem on the college level might be, in a sense, remedial, it was decided that a more constructive approach must be used, and since the project was imbedded in the communication course, classroom instruction must be geared to both the objectives of the course and the objectives of the project. The question, therefore, was how to organize and integrate content so that pattern practice could be used in more meaningful context and more palatable form. After much experimenting and shift of emphasis, a procedure was finally decided upon for the third and final year of the project.

Spelling and Pronunciation--Immediately after a discussion of the meaning of "communication" and the importance of the four phases of communication (reading, writing, listening, and speaking), the difference between spoken English and written English was emphasized. This led to a discussion of the levels of usage, emphasizing the differences between dialectal (nonstandard), colloquial (standard), and formal usages. Next came a discussion of the nature of speech sounds and the characteristics of the written symbols of English (including non-verbal symbols such as punctuation marks), emphasizing the key concept that the sound is not the spelling, and that the pause in speech is not always the same as the comma in punctuation.

Then, the students were shown how to recognize certain spelling patterns as representing certain sound segments and how intonation patterns could signal structural units and could be used to tell a good sentence from a fragmentary or run-on sentence.

Thus from the very beginning, the students were required to listen carefully to the sounds of English and to use them to improve spelling and to effect the proper use of end punctuations, two areas in which the students had considerable difficulty.

In the spelling lessons, which constituted the first unit of instruction and drill, students were asked to spell words that they could use easily in speaking but had difficulty in spelling. In the process, they were required to answer a few questions for each word on the spelling list, sometimes in unison, sometimes individually. For the word *ceiling*, for example:

Teacher: How does this word begin? It begins with what letter?

Student: *C*.

Teacher: Use complete sentences, and make clear that you refer to the sound or the letter. Say: the word *ceiling* begins with the letter *c*.

Student: It begins with the letter *c*.

Teacher: Correct. It begins with the letter *c* in spelling. Now how does this word begin in sound? It begins with what sound?

Student: It begins with the *c* sound.

Teacher: No. Listen once more: *cei* ling. It begins with what sound? *Cei*ling. *Cei*ling.

Student: It begins with the *s* sound.

Teacher: Correct. It begins with the *s* sound. What sound does the letter *c* represent in this word?

Student: It represents the *s* sound.

In this manner, the students not only learned to observe the relationship between the sound and the spelling, but also had the opportunity to repeat the following patterns many times:

The word_____begins with the _____ sound.
It begins with the letter ___.
Here the letter ___ represents the ___ sound.
The word _____ ends with the spelling ___.
It ends with the ___ sound.
Here the spelling ___ represents the ___ sound.

There are three syllables in the word *represent*.
The accent falls on the third syllable.
There are four syllables in the word *curriculum*.
The accent falls on the second syllable.

Since the third-person-singular verb form and the *there are* pattern were items in which these students needed much practice, sentences like these in form would have already been used in pattern practice drills. Here they appeared in the context of a "college level" discussion.

Many students had difficulty with spelling because they were afraid of long words. When they learned to count the number of syllables and to handle one syllable at a time, recognizing the sound segments in the process, they began to spell and pronounce words with more confidence and fewer errors.

Many spelling errors occurred as a result of mispronunciation and poor enunciation habits. To improve the students' pronunciation and enunciation, methods of articulation involving various parts of the speech organs were explained whenever necessary. The difference between /d/ and /th/, as in the dialectal *dis* and *dat* vs. *this* and *that*, the difference between /n/ and /ng/, as in *sin* vs. *sing*, were explained and practiced. Isolated instances of mispronunciation, such as *ask*, which some students pronounced as *ax*; *picture*, which some students pronounced as *pitcher*; and words like *stretch*, *straight*, and *street*, which some students pronounced *scretch*, *scrate*, and *screet*, received due attention whenever they occurred. This difficulty with the consonant clusters, I believe, also caused students to drop the grammatical endings in words like *consists*, *months*, *helped*, and *talked*. In this case, pronunciation or enunciation practice was used for pattern practice as well. The first step concentrated on verbs in which the *ed* ending constituted an extra syllable, while the second step dealt with the *ed* ending which made up a consonant cluster. The entire emphasis in dealing with speech sounds, however, was on the training of sense perceptions, auditory, visual (in relating spelling to sound), and kinetic, rather than on a systematic description of English phonetics or phonemics.

To add interest and to provide more opportunities for repetitious practice, students' attention was called to the fact that the *s* ending actually represented three different sounds, the *s* sound after voiceless consonants *p* *t* *k*, the *z* sound after vowels or voiced consonants *b* *d* *g* *m* *n* *ng* *l* *r*, and an extra syllable /*ɪz*/ after the sibilants *s*, *ch*, *sh* and their voiced counterparts. Students were asked to give sentences such as

John goes............every day;
John gets up.............every day;
John eats breakfast.............every day;

or:

I have two hands;
I have three books; etc.;

and to determine the sound value of each *s* ending. Later on, the *ed* ending was given a similar treatment, and students did not mind repeating many verbs with the *ed* ending and telling whether the last sound was /t/ or /d/ or an extra syllable /ɪd/. Words with the *s* ending or the *ed* ending were then used in spelling practice, but the students' questions "Is it in the past tense?" "Is it plural?" "Is it third person singular?" were not answered. They were told to write down what they heard. Sometimes another student was asked to repeat the word to demonstrate to the questioning students that he could hear the ending without difficulty. In the spelling test, which usually consisted of 20-25 words and was given about once a week, the teacher always made it clear that she would not pronounce the same word more than twice, thus forcing the students into the habit of listening attentively.

At the end of the spelling test, a student would be asked to read the entire list of words to practice correct pronunciation and enunciation and to give the others a chance to proofread the test. The teacher, in the meantime, could throw in a few pattern practice questions for the student or the class to answer. Since the students needed repeated practice on the pattern *there are* (vs. *there is*) and the third-person-singular verb forms, questions such as "How many syllables are there in the word _____?" "The first syllable begins with what sound?" "Where does the accent fall?" etc., must be answered with standard usage patterns as well as correct information.

At a later stage, derivational words were added in spelling practice. The first unit on the spelling test would start with, for example, the word *necessary*, which the students had already learned to spell correctly. The teacher would go on to *necessarily*, *necessity*, *necessitate*, etc. In this process the students learned

1. How a shift of accent could give a word an entirely different aural impression, and how words that

sounded very different could be related in meaning and spelling.

2. How to relate derivational suffixes with four important parts of speech (noun, verb, adjective, adverb).

3. How to relate unfamiliar words to familiar words and to use the latter as a guide to the spelling of the former.

After some practice, students were expected to be able to shift a word from one part of speech to another and to spell the high-frequency derivational forms without difficulty, and all the cognate words in a unit had to be correct before the student could receive credit for that unit.

In addition to the two questions concerning the number of syllables and the accent in a word, one more question was added to effect oral pattern practice in the use of the third person singular pattern.

What does the ity ending in this word signify?
It signifies a noun.

What does the ly ending in this word signify?
It signifies an adverb.

According to our experience, this inductive way of presenting the suffixes seemed more effective than giving the student a list of suffixes with examples to memorize, as advocated in many textbooks.

Throughout the process of learning to spell, students were also beginning to learn:

1. to listen attentively to sharpen aural perceptions of sound elements in words.
2. to grasp the relationship between sound, spelling, grammar, and meaning of words.
3. to observe how speech sounds are made and to enunciate words distinctly.

4. to use verb forms correctly in questions and answers.[12]

Reading and Dictation--Reading instruction began with a six-hour series of lectures, discussions, experiences with reading films, and tests conducted by the director of the reading program to orient students in the method of better speed and comprehension in reading. Students were also required to read periodically at laboratory sessions when awaiting their turns to use the recorders or to do supervised small-group practice. Many books were available for students to browse through during these sessions.

In the classroom a reading anthology entitled Improving College English Skills was used as text.[13] Selected articles, all expositions on various phases of the communication skills, were used for practice in silent reading in class, followed by a reading comprehension test which was also included in the text. New vocabulary items from the selections were added to the spelling list.

Oral reading was also used to check pronunciation and enunciation, proper phrasing, and the awareness of inflectional forms. One or two short passages were chosen from each article for dictation.

---

[12] It should be mentioned that spelling instruction and practice as well as other forms of instruction discussed in this chapter were given to both the experimental and the control groups in the final year of the project. The control students, however, did not receive the related pattern practice. For example, when the instructor asked, "How many syllables are there in the word curriculum?" the students would normally answer "four." In the control classes, the instructor would be satisfied as long as the answer was correct. In the experimental classes, however, the instructor would say, "Yes, there are four syllables in the word curriculum. Repeat it: There are four syllables in the word curriculum." In this way, pattern practice would continue throughout the class hour.

[13] Leslie Wilbur and Lowell Dabbs (eds.), Improving College English Skills. (Scott, Foresman & Company, 1962.)

The passages chosen usually had a concentration of one pattern or another which could lead logically to pattern practice.[14]

Dictation followed a strictly prescribed procedure. The teacher would read an entire sentence (or an entire independent clause in a compound sentence) while the students carefully listened, trying to grasp the meaning and the general structure of the sentence without writing down anything. Then the teacher would read the sentence a second time to allow the students to get the exact wording, and the students were expected to repeat in unison. The teacher would repeat the sentence as many times as necessary, always allowing time for the students to repeat after her. Only when the students could say the sentence correctly and smoothly were they permitted to write down the sentence. This procedure was repeated for each sentence until, at the end of the passage, the teacher would read the entire passage once more for proofreading, or she would ask a competent student to do it for her.

In this way dictation was really vigorous pattern practice reenforced by writing. It also helped students to grasp sentence structure through assimilation.

Students in general, at least in the beginning, found this kind of dictation very difficult. While conscientious students doggedly accepted the challenge, the slower ones simply threw up their hands in despair. In this case the teacher would help in a variety of ways. She might repeat the sentence along with the students, emphasizing words and endings that the students missed; she might start each phrase and let the students finish it; or she might pose questions to help students understand the structure of the sentence.

---

[14] The passages used for dictation in the control classes did not have a concentration of a particular grammatical pattern.

Take, for example, the following short passage:

> ....A cultivated, intelligent man, his mind roamed a far wider field of knowledge than mine.... He kept me walking up to the frontiers of my knowledge--and it wasn't a long journey. I set out to push back those frontiers. And I tried constantly to discuss with friends ideas resulting from my reading. I find that when I tried to express these ideas I didn't always understand them as clearly as I had supposed I did. So I went back and read more on the subject until I could discuss it without faltering.[15]

Before the dictation the teacher sometimes used questions to elicit answers using the past form of verbs and to bring about a better understanding of the sentences. With their books open, the students should not have had difficulty with the answers, and the teacher would insist on a clear enunciation of the past form verbs. For example:

Teacher: The author described Conway as a cultivated, intelligent man. What did Conway's mind do?

Students: His mind roamed a far wider field of knowledge.

Teacher: His mind roamed a field of knowledge far wider than what?

Students: Wider than Bevan's.

Teacher: All right. Now, repeat the whole thing without looking at the book: His mind....

Students: His mind roamed a far wider field of knowledge than mine.

Teacher: Look at the second sentence. What did Conway make Bevan do? Answer as if you were Bevan.

Students: He kept me walking up to the frontiers of my knowledge.

Teacher: Say it again, without looking at the book.

---

[15] Aneurin Bevan, "The Best Advice I Ever Had," Ibid., p. 107, reprinted from The Reader's Digest, October, 1953, pp. 91-92. Copyright, 1953, by The Reader's Digest Association, Inc. Used here by permission of The Reader's Digest.

Students: He kept me walking up to the frontiers of my knowledge.

Teacher: What did Bevan do? Use his own words.

Students: I push back those frontiers.

Teacher: No, take a good look at the sentence.

Students: I set out to push back those frontiers.

Teacher: And....

Students: And I tried constantly to discuss with friends ideas resulting from my reading.

Teacher: Now, say it again, without looking. And I tried....

Students: And I tried to discuss....

Teacher: And I tried constantly....

Students: And I tried constantly to discuss....

When the students learned how a sentence was developed by adding on details, dictation became easier and more rewarding.

Material for dictation did not always come from the textbook. Dictation lessons could be designed to solve a particular problem. For the spelling of homonyms which can be taught only in context, for instance, a group of sentences illustrating contrasting patterns in which the homonyms are used, can be utilized for dictation as well as pattern practice.

To help students spell to and too correctly, a pair of homonyms which confused many students, the following dictation lesson was used:

1. This is too good to be true.
2. You're too old to cry like this.
3. It's much too cold to swim.
4. It's too windy to go out.
5. This room is too small for all of us to be comfortable.
6. I'm too tired to work any more today.
7. His parents are too poor to send him to college.
8. I go to class at 8:30 and my roommate does, too.

9. He always attempted to do too much. Consequently, his work wasn't too satisfactory.
10. I talked to the counselor and Mary did, too.

The teacher first read the sentences, asking the students to repeat each sentence after her, calling on the students to observe how too and to were pronounced in a sentence. The teacher called attention to the fact that too was stressed while to was not. Then the students were asked to write down the sentences, using their ears as guides in spelling the homonyms in question.

The pair than and then was treated in a similar manner. Sentences using than could further be used in practicing the comparative pattern (more than or taller than) which could lead students away from the dialect pattern of double comparison (such as "more taller than"). On the other hand, sentences using then could be used to explain punctuation, particularly the use of the semicolon to separate two independent clauses not joined by a conjunction.

These lessons could be used early in spelling practice together with the lessons differentiating other homonyms. Or they could be used to illustrate the difference between content words (lexical symbols which are often stressed in a sentence) and function words (grammatical symbols which are almost always unstressed in a sentence). Too and then, as adverbs, are stressed while to, as a sign of the infinitive or as a preposition, and than, as a conjunction, are unstressed.

Many passages from The New English Bible--New Testament proved to be ideal for audio-lingual practice followed by dictation. The teachings and parables of the Bible were familiar to many students, but they were never felt to be trite or trivial. The sentences were short and oftentimes repetitious, but were never monotonous or boring. Both in sentence structure and in style, Biblical sentences furnished the best models available, and the teacher never needed to apologize for requesting students to repeat or to memorize them.

Examples of Biblical verses used for pattern practice and dictation are as follows:[16]

1. For third-person-singular-present-tense verb with s ending

> Ask, and you will receive; seek, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened. For everyone who asks receives, he who seeks finds, and to him who knocks, the door will be opened.
>
> --Matthew 7:7-8

2. The past form

> What then of the man who hears these words of mine and acts upon them? He is like a man who had the sense to build his house on rock. The rain came down, the floods rose, the wind blew, and beat upon that house; but it did not fall, because its foundations were on rock. But what of the man who hears these words of mine and does not act upon them? He is like a man who was foolish enough to build his house on sand. The rain came down, the floods rose, the wind blew, and beat upon that house; down it fell with a great crash.
>
> --Matthew 7:24-28

3. The passive voice and the participle

> Pass no judgement, and you will not be judged; do not condemn, and you will not be condemned; acquit, and you will be acquitted; give, and gifts will be given you. Good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over, will be poured into your lap; for whatever measure you deal out to others will be dealt to you in return.[17]
>
> --Luke 6:37-38

---

[16] While these passages were used for the pattern practice group or experimental group, other passages from the same source which did not provide opportunities for pattern practice were used for the control group.

[17] The New English Bible: New Testament. pp. 12-13, 106. Copyright by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press and the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, 1961. Used by permission of the publishers.

Grammar, Pattern Practice, and Writing--After the discussion of the four important parts of speech (noun, verb, adjective and adverb; or the four form classes of content words) in connection with grammatical endings (s, ed, ing, er, est) and derivational forms (necessary, necessarily, necessity, necessitate, etc.), and the discussions of function words vs. content words in connection with their stress patterns in a sentence, grammar instruction began with the basic patterns of an English statement with a positive verb in the active voice.

The three basic patterns are:

Pattern I Subject + transitive verb + object
Pattern II Subject + linking verb + subject complement
Pattern III Subject + intransitive verb + adverb.[18]

The teacher would give a few examples to illustrate each pattern. Then the students were asked to volunteer more examples. With some specifications, a period of grammar instruction could easily be turned into a period of pattern practice.[19]

With Pattern I, the teacher could specify that each student offering an example must begin the sentence with the subject he and add the word yesterday at the end of each sentence, and the students would probably come up with examples similar to the following:

He read a book yesterday.
He ate an orange yesterday.
He drove his car yesterday, etc.

When a student mumbled, he was asked to repeat his sentence distinctly. Or a student in another part of the room was asked to repeat what the first student said. This was to impress upon the students (1) the importance of speaking distinctly for everybody to hear, not just for the teacher, and (2) the courtesy of listening attentively when a classmate spoke.

---

[18] The adverb is not a basic sentence element and its inclusion is optional. Here it is included to provide contrast with other patterns.

[19] Control students received grammar instruction in the form of lecture and discussion.

If the teacher specified that everyone should begin his sentence with the subject he and use the words every day to end the sentence, she would get the following examples:

He reads a book every day.
He eats an orange every day.
He drives his car every day.

Emphasis, of course, was not only on the correct sentence pattern but also on the correct verb form in standard English.

The teacher could further specify that each example should begin with a pronoun and end with a pronoun, expecting sentences like:

He loves her.
He saw her.
I met her.
She taught me.

When the sentence pattern became familiar and the inflectional forms did not seem to give trouble, the teacher would specify speed and the use of a different verb in each sentence. When attention began to wander, the teacher could instantly stop the oral practice and begin a writing lesson. Each student would write down all the examples he could remember, underlining the subject once, the predicate twice, and underlining and labeling the object with an o. While the students were busy writing, the teacher could go from one student to another to point out careless mistakes in grammar and mechanics and to assist those who needed extra help.

The basic pattern could be extended by compounding the subject, or the verb, or the object, or by adding modifiers. Examples of compound subject, or compound verbs, or both, could be used to effect pattern practice in subject-verb agreement, while the compound object and the prepositional phrase as modifier could provide further practice with pronoun case forms.

Examples of Pattern II sentences could bring out various linking verbs while those of Pattern III sentences could familiarize students with different intransitive verbs. Both could provide more practice for plural nouns as subjects or subject complements, verb tenses, and subject-verb agreement. These two patterns, used in contrast, could reveal another difference between standard English and the local dialect and could further be used for pattern practice in connection with the use of adjectives versus adverbs:

> The dancer was good.
> The dancer danced well. (Compared with dialectal usage:
> The dancer danced good.)
>
> Connie's voice was beautiful.
> Connie sang beautifully. (Compared with dialectal usage:
> Connie sang beautiful.)

Practice in transforming a statement into a question, or a positive statement into one with a negative verb, or a statement in the active voice to one in the passive voice, was extremely important for the students because of the effect the transformation had on the verb form. Compare the following:

a. A student have.... (dialectal usage)
b. A student has.... (standard usage in a statement)
c. Does a student have.... (standard usage in a question)
d. A student had.... (standard usage in a statement)
e. Did a student have.... (standard usage in a question)

It took considerable practice for the students to master forms "c" and "e" without reverting to "a" or creating something as bizarre as does a student has or did a student has....

Practice in changing a positive into a negative statement helped students establish correct usage in verb phrases and to avoid the use of double negative. On the other hand, changing a sentence from the active voice to the passive voice revealed more forms that a verb phrase could take and provided more oral practice on the use of the verb to be in its diverse forms, the past participle forms with the ed ending, and the past participle forms of some irregular verbs.

In this manner, each period of "grammar" began with a brief discussion of the structure in question followed by examples furnished by the students, who were actually creating their own material for pattern practice, and ended with an exercise, or putting down the oral practice in written form.

Writing in the form of composition was assigned with some definite pattern in mind. Some topics called for the narration of past experiences using the past tense. Summarizing an article in the textbook, the students would discuss what a good reader (or a good speaker) does or does not do.

In intensive reading and in the discussion of sentence structure, comparison was made between a compound sentence with independent clauses, a complex sentence with one or more clauses subordinated, and a simple sentence with participial, infinitive, or prepositional phrases. The effect of using questions vs. statements, or passive vs. active voice on the writing style was also observed and discussed, and the students were encouraged to apply their knowledge of grammar in theme writing. Above all, they were required to proofread carefully to cultivate the habit of checking their own careless mistakes, and to revise a theme already checked by the instructor.

Another form of composition, the writing of role-playing skits during laboratory sessions, will be discussed in the following section.

C. Small Group Practice and Role Playing

Pattern practice in groups of eight to ten students supervised by the assistant provided some advantages over practice with the tape recorder. Students, on the whole, demonstrated more initiative in a give and take, conversational type of practice. They reminded one another to adhere to a pattern and they promptly corrected one another's mistakes. A few students--who did not need, or thought that they did not need a particular practice--derived satisfaction in playing the role of leader while actually participating in the practice themselves. Most students seemed to be more willing to do oral practice when they could enjoy the attention of the laboratory assistant and their peers. Some students even refused to leave at the end of the 25 minute practice sessions and stayed on with the second group until the end of the hour.

The laboratory assistant would start off with one of a series of language laboratory lessons and set the stage for a particular pattern to be practiced. The students, however, would soon take over and make up their own sentences. They compared notes about one another's home town, each telling what his home town had or didn't have, using patterns like "My home town has...," "My home town does not have...," "There are three elementary schools but there is only one Negro high school," etc. They related some of their own experiences (using the past tense or the present perfect), summarized stories they had read (past or historical present), discussed a member of the family, a classmate, or roommate (third person singular), or created a variety of situations in which they could talk in one pattern or another. Occasionally they did choral reading, reciting poems or Bible verses. One of the poems which the students enjoyed most was James Weldon Johnson's "Creation," which uses an abundance of past tense verbs, both regular and irregular.

When the students were not in a very creative mood, they could always fall back on the laboratory lessons, which were mimeographed and distributed to them.

Another phase of practice work, in addition to small-group practice and tape-recorded individual practice, was role playing. The purpose of role playing used for guidance or therapy is to permit students to dramatize or act out their own problems. In our project, we found the students too sophisticated or stereotyped in their thinking about their language problems. Two skits on "Good English" were presented by two separate groups of project students in April, 1962. One presented an English classroom in which a "poor" student employed substandard usage which was promptly corrected by the teacher, who went on to reprimand the student for not using good English as the teacher had so often told him to do. Then a "good" student stood up to tell the "poor" student how important good English was and how they must all study the rules. It was amazing to see how old ideas could persist even in young adults.

Another skit presented a courtroom scene in which "Good English" prosecuted "Bad Grammar" for injuries to society. The judge found "Bad Grammar" guilty and sentenced him to spend a year in the language laboratory! A member of the project staff who was familiar with the activities of the high schools disclosed that, except for the part of the language laboratory, the entire skit was originally a high school play. The language laboratory as a means of punishment for the culprit was hardly the image that the project staff intended to invoke.

Thereafter no further attempt was made to encourage the students to dramatize their language problems "spontaneously." Role playing was used, rather, to create realistic life situations in which people were expected to use standard English and to help students project themselves into such roles. Many students, who had had very limited social experiences, wanted to know how to act and what to say in certain situations. Skits and dialogues dramatizing dating etiquette, consultation with advisor, job interviews, employer-secretary conversations, etc., proved interesting and helpful to them. However, it was the belief of the staff that the students should write their own skits to make the role-playing experience more meaningful. Toward the end of the second year of the project, the students were divided into small groups of four or five to work out skits with a role for each member, practice the parts with the tape recorder, then present the skits in their respective classes. The content and organization of each skit were discussed in class and the scripts were revised for further oral practice. Then the best skit in each class was selected to represent the class in a chapel program. The entire experience was so stimulating to the students--and the speech patterns of a few students changed so conspicuously--that staff members decided role playing should start earlier in the third year so that its potentialities in motivating better speech and usage could be further explored.

In the second semester of the third year, laboratory sessions were devoted almost exclusively to role-playing activities. A staff member (who was also the advisor of the college dramatics club), assisted by the language laboratory assistant, planned and directed the activities. The students, divided into groups, would discuss, write, practice, and then present a skit in the course of one week (five class hours). Detailed instructions were mimeographed and distributed to the students. Samples of the instructions were as follows:

> In the following exercises you will assume the personality of another individual. You will attempt to act and speak as you think he would. Keep in mind the situation. Try to make your role-playing interesting. Write a brief description of the room in which you are having this experience.
>
> 1. Characters: Personnel Director
> Mother
> Student
> Situation: A personnel director speaks to a mother who has come to the college to take her son home. She has received his nine weeks' grades and has decided that he is playing instead of studying. The personnel director describes the problems of adjustment that some freshmen have. The mother asks questions. The director replies. The student enters and tells what happened to cause his low grades. His mother lets him stay.
> Patterns: Present tense, third person, singular number--first part of skit: "During the freshman year a student explores..." Past tense--after the student enters: "I went to the...."
>
> 2. Characters: President of a corporation
> Managers
> Situation: The president of a corporation, speaking to new managers, gives the history of the organization. He commends old employees, and tells of the growth of the business. Managers should have two questions each.
> Patterns: Perfect tense: "has grown," "has developed."

3. Characters: Teacher
Group of students
Situation: A teacher is speaking to a Parent-Teacher Association Committee. She lists the various materials and equipment that the school does not have. She urges the committee to ask the Board of Education to secure these things. The students help her by answering her requests: "Louise, tell the committee what we need in the gymnasium." She asks each one to report about a specific area. Sentences should be interesting.
Patterns: "Doesn't have" "Has no" "Don't have" "Have no"[20]

In addition to the characters required in a skit, each group had a narrator to describe not only the scene but also the characters, using the third person, singular, present tense pattern. The two classroom teachers were invited in to view the "finished" productions and to offer comments when students were ready to perform. In April, after two months of role-playing exercises, each group chose their best skit to compete in class; and each class, together with the staff, selected the best skit to appear in chapel.[21] Most students found the experience interesting and profitable, although at the beginning it took considerable time for them to get adjusted to the new procedure and to understand what was expected of them. Some students were "scared to death" at the thought of appearing in a play. Others had difficulty getting along with their peers when a high degree of cooperation was necessary for such performance. At the end of the semester, however, many students commented that the most valuable things they learned in the role-playing experience were to overcome their stage fright and to get along with fellow classmates.

---

[20] The control group also engaged in role-playing activities, but had no restrictions in the use of patterns in their skits.

[21] For samples of students' skits, see Appendix C.

Even though the director of role-playing activities and the assistant encouraged good speech and usage as much as organizational unity in the skits and realistic interpretations of the characters, the students, understandably, soon became more concerned with dramatics than with oral practice. In general, the students seemed to spend more time on planning and writing the skits than on practicing and learning the scripts. Some had to lean on and read from the script during performance; others, not remembering, improvised and broke down. One student, who had always strived to give the impression that he had good control of standard English, broke down so badly that he gave up trying the rest of the semester. Many others, on the other hand, genuinely applied themselves and greatly improved their ability to speak to an audience.

Reviewing the role-playing program for the final year, staff members agreed that too much might have been attempted in too short a time. Because of the students' lack of experience in dramatics and in human relations in a larger society, much more guidance and planning seemed necessary to help the students understand the different roles in a situation and the language expected in that situation. Perhaps a single skit for each group, carefully developed and practiced, might prove more valuable than several skits worked out in insufficient time.

CHAPTER IV. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A. The Standardized Test and the Local Test

During the first year of the project, evaluation was based on 1) the New Purdue Placement Test in English, 2) an essay test, and 3) the students' personal interviews recorded on tapes. The tests and interviews were conducted in September, 1961, and again in March, 1962, allowing sufficient time to study the results and to make plans for the following year. The emphasis in the first year, however, was not so much on the evaluation of the instructional program as it was on the evaluation of the evaluative procedure itself.

The Purdue English Test was chosen because it had been used as a placement test for the homogeneous grouping of all the communication classes, and it seemed to cover a wider area of English proficiency than many other tests. It is divided into seven parts: Part 1, recognition of grammatical errors; Part 2, punctuation; Part 3, sentence clearness and effectiveness; Parts 4 and 5, reading; Part 6, vocabulary; and Part 7, spelling. According to test scores, the 51 project students who took both the initial and the final tests made considerable progress in spelling and reading, some progress in punctuation and vocabulary, a little progress in grammar, and no progress at all in sentence effectiveness. (See Table I.)

From these results the following conclusions were drawn: 1)in making way for oral practice, the project staff had probably neglected writing and effectiveness in sentence structure, 2) concentrating on a limited number of structural patterns which distinguish standard English from the local dialect, the staff had not covered a

TABLE 1. MEAN SCORES, MEAN GAIN, AND PERCENTAGE OF GAIN IN SIX AREAS OF ENGLISH PROFICIENCY ON THE PURDUE PLACEMENT TEST IN ENGLISH, FORMS D AND E, ADMINISTERED TO 51 PROJECT STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER, 1961, AND MAY, 1962.

	Part 1 Recognition of Grammatical Errors	Part 2 Punctuation	Part 3 Sentence Clearness and Effectiveness	Parts 4-5 Reading	Part 6 Vocabulary	Part 7 Spelling
Maximum Possible Score	30	45	30	30	45	45
Mean Score on Initial Test	14.3	20.9	15.7	9.6	10.3	17.1
Mean Gain	.9	2.6	-.8	3.8	1.1	3.8
Percentage of Gain	6.3%	12.4%	-5.1%	39.6%	10.7%	22.2%

sufficiently wide range of grammatical items often included in English tests.

The project staff, in the meantime, seriously questioned the fitness of the Purdue Test for the evaluation of the project. What really troubled the staff was that 22 of the 51 project students who took the test showed a regression of 1-8 points on the grammar section. Among 54 other freshmen who were not in the project, 18 showed similar regression, making a total of 40 out of 105 students in the entire freshman class, or more than 38 per cent, whose scores retrogressed. The staff decided to find out the cause of this retrogression.

A closer look at the Purdue Test revealed that the sections on reading, vocabulary, and spelling used multiple choice questions, whereas the sections on grammar, punctuation, and sentence effectiveness employed the true-false method with no penalty for wrong answers or for guessing. Further, in a normal true-or-false test a statement is taken as a whole as either true or false, thus giving the students a 50-50 chance. On a true-or-false grammar test each word in a sentence is a potential error; and the student who fails to locate an error, but sees one where there is none, is actually rewarded for making two mistakes! This possibility was probably responsible in part for the better scores many students achieved on the first test.

As a result, the project staff made a study of other English tests in order to select a standardized test best suited for the objective of the project and to determine whether a local grammar test should be constructed specifically for the project.

The objective of the project was to emphasize the use of standard English, particularly oral English, whereas a standardized test stresses recognition of grammatical errors in written form. This was why the project staff, from the beginning, had decided to include an essay test to evaluate the students' ability to use standard English in writing and an interview to evaluate the students' ability to use standard English in speaking. The staff also considered it necessary to include a standardized test to measure the students' general ability in English expression and reading comprehension in comparison with national norms. However, between the standardized test on the one hand and the subjective essay test and the interview on the other, they increasingly felt that the project needed an objective test designed to meet its own needs. This locally designed objective test must be easy to score objectively, leaving little or no room for the subjective judgment of individual scorers. Yet, it must require not just the recognition of errors, but also the production of the corresponding correct forms by the students. In a spelling test, for example, the students should be required to write down each word as it is pronounced by the instructor, not just to recognize a misspelled word printed in the test. In a grammar and usage test, the students should be able to pinpoint a mistake in a sentence and underline it, and to write the correct form on a line at the right-hand margin. Each item on the test must contain no more than one mistake which is clearly a deviation from standard usage, although a few sentences may contain no mistakes at all. In this case the student should underline nothing but should make a check on the appropriate line at the right-hand margin.

With the format of the local grammar test worked out, the next step was to ascertain what categories to include and in what proportion.

A previous study of the project students' dialect patterns in speech and in writing gave the staff a fairly good picture of what the emphasis should be. A study of comparable parts in the Purdue Test, Forms D and E; the New Cooperative English Test, 1960 Edition, Forms 1A and 2A; and The Old Cooperative English Test, 1949 Edition, Form RX, furnished further information concerning the relative importance of different categories and the direction of change in the testing of English as seen by experts in testing. A list of 50 items to be included in the local test was compiled. The New Cooperative English Test, 1960 Edition, Form 2A (together with its comparable forms), which seemed closest to the local test in its coverage, was selected as the standardized test to be used in the subsequent years of the project. (See Table 2.)

Since the students seemed to have the greatest difficulty with the verb, 20 of the 50 items in the local test were devoted to this category, with eight to verb forms, both regular and irregular, eight to subject-verb agreement, two to verb tense, and two to the transitive-intransitive sets such as sit-set, lie-lay, and rise-raise. Ten more items were devoted to double constructions (double negative, double subject, double comparison) and the noun forms (both the plural and the possessive), two other major areas of difficulty for the students. The other twenty were evenly divided between other parts of speech and mechanics.

In addition to the format, the major difference between the New Cooperative English Test and the local grammar test is that the former emphasizes internal inflections and irregular forms whereas the latter places equal emphasis on both internal and final inflections and both the regular and the irregular verb and noun forms.

TABLE 2. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE CATEGORIES USED IN DIFFERENT OBJECTIVE TESTS OF GRAMMAR AND USAGE.

Categories	Purdue Test Part I Recognizing Grammatical Errors		CET: 1949 High Level Part I Grammatical Usage	CET: 1960 English Expression Part II Mechanics		Local Test Part I Grammar
	Form D	Form E	Form RX	Form 1A	Form 2A	
Spelling						
Homonyms	---	---	2	3	4	2
Others	---*	---*	---*	9	1	---*
Apostrophe	---*	---*	---*	2	2	2
Capital letter	---*	---*	---*	1	3	2
Punctuation	---*	---*	---*	9	5	2
Sentence Structure						
Run-on sentence	---	---	---	3	1	2
Sentence fragment	---	---	---	1	1	---
Double negative	---	---	3	1	2	2
Double subject	---	---	---	---	1	2
Double comparison	---	---	---	---	1	2
Verb tense	2	1	3	1	2	2
Verb form						
Regular	1	1	---	---	---	3
Irregular	6	3	10	2	5	5
Sub.-vb. agreement	10	9	12	4	7	8**
Misuse of verb (sit-set, lie-lay)	1	3	1	1	2	2
Noun plural	1	1	2	---	---	3
Noun possessive	---	---	---	---	---	1
Pronoun form	6	8	9	3	2	2
Pronoun reference	---	---	2	2	2	2
Adj.-adv.	3	4	3	1	1	2
Preposition-Conjunction	---	---	6	---	---	2
Noun determiner	---	---	---	---	---	2
Vocabulary (learn for teach, etc.)	---	---	1	2	3	---
Unspecified (no mistakes)	---	---	6	15	15	---
TOTAL:	30	30	60	60	60	50

---

*Included in a separate part of the test.

**This category in the local grammar test includes third person singular, present tense pattern (3), the verb to be (1), verb with a compound subject (2), verb with a subject using either or neither (1), subject and verb separated by an intervening noun (2), and verb preceding subject (1).

After the items to be included were decided upon, a set of three sentences comparable in length and complexity and with the error included were written for each item. A different sentence chosen arbitrarily from each item, arranged in random order, made up the different forms of the local test. (See Appendix D.)

The local test was given to more than 150 freshmen, including both project and non-project students, first in September, 1962, and again in May, 1963, when the New Cooperative English Tests, Forms 2A and 2B, were also given. Each time the local grammar test showed a high correlation with the New Cooperative English Expression Test as well as a high correlation between its two subtests.[22] Its usefulness assured, the local test was used again in 1963-64, together with other tests, for placement as well as for the evaluation of the project.

The students' achievement on the local grammar test rested partly on the students' knowledge and understanding of English grammar and usage, and partly on the students' attentiveness and alertness in checking the test items. To help the students become more alert to the kind of mistakes they were used to making and establish the habit of proofreading what they wrote and what other people wrote, quizzes using the same format as the local test but consisting of entirely different sentences, usually sentences taken from the textbook or pattern practice lessons but changed to include an error, were given to the students periodically.

---

[22] The correlation between the local grammar test and the CET: English Expression in September, 1962, is .83 and in May, 1963, is .71. The correlation between two subtests of the local grammar test given in September, 1962, is .82 and in May, 1963, is .85.

The local test, of course, is not entirely objective. In some places it does permit some kind of subjective interpretation. For example, in the sentence "I might could do it if you would let me try..." some students changed *I might could* to *I might*, or *I could*, or *I may be able to*, while others used *I might be able to*, *Perhaps I could*, or *Maybe I could*. After some discussion, the two instructors who scored the test decided that even though the first group of students pinpointed and eliminated the nonstandard usage, they should not receive credit because their corrections did not adhere to the original meaning of the sentence. Another sentence, "Registration begins on Wednesday, classes begin two days later." was considered a run-on sentence by one instructor, but as acceptable by another because both clauses are short. Problems like these, however, can easily be solved by a little discussion between the two scorers or can be eliminated in the future by a change of phrasing.

According to test results over a period of two years, items that were missed by most students in both the initial and the final tests were those that involved usages "against the grammar rules" but increasingly accepted in colloquial situations, e.g.:

> Neither you nor I *are* wrong....
> The book *laid* on the shelf all day yesterday....
> Everyone was supposed to bring *their* lunch....
> It is *real* good....
> This color is different *than* that.

These "mistakes" quite understandably went unnoticed not only because they were heard very frequently even among educated people but also because they were not included for elimination by pattern practice, although their inappropriateness in written English was explained. They were included in the test, however, to alert the students to the difference between what is acceptable in speaking and in writing. Some of the expressions which appear more and more frequently in print should perhaps be eventually eliminated from the test.

Another item which caused considerable difficulty on the end-of-the-year tests was the sentence "The children clothes should be kept clean and laundered frequently." While students seemed to have little difficulty with noun possessive in another sentence, "This is Mrs. Browns house...," about half of the students in May, 1963, and about two thirds in May, 1964, could not locate the mistake "children clothes." Students must have been told often enough never to say "childrens," and the teacher had probably forgotten that "children's" and "childrens" were exactly alike except in writing. In use of pronoun forms, only a small number of students recognized an error in "between you and I" while four times as many recognized one in "Mary and me can...." These examples showed another advantage of the local test--information turned up in unexpected places.

In conclusion, by requiring students to make more positive responses than blackening a space in a multiple choice question, the local grammar test can pinpoint the students' weaknesses for the instructor as well as for the students themselves. It is not too difficult to construct, is simple to administer and to score, and can be tied in with the instructional program in a way no standardized tests can.

B. The Essay Test

The essay test was used in the project to measure the students' ability to use standard English in writing. Any English teacher who has read student themes realizes that they are difficult to judge. Soundness of ideas, coherence and unity in organization, style, sentence structure, grammar, and mechanics, all enter into the creation of a total impression. None of the many factors can be ignored, and none can be easily separated from the others. Some teachers make it a policy not to grade a theme but instead offer an extensive terminal comment on its strengths and weaknesses.[23] At Claflin College, we use both terminal remarks and individual conferences which enable the teacher and the student to evaluate a theme together. In the evaluation of the project via the essay test, however, grammar and usage had to be isolated as the focus, and incidents of deviate or nonstandard patterns had to be quantified before statistical work could be done.

The job did not seem toodifficult in the beginning. Those in charge of statistics decided that the essay test should be evaluated in terms of number of errors per hundred words, and those who checked the essays simply counted the errors and the number of words in each essay. They had not gone very far, of course, before they ran into arguments as to what constituted an error. After considerable discussion, it was decided that all areas of disagreement, including choice of words, stylistic matters, and disputed or divided usages should be eliminated from consideration, and attention should be focused on what was clearly an error or a nonstandard usage. It was further decided that colloquial usages contrary to the rules but acceptable in everyday speech or informal writing, such as who for whom, different than for different from, like for as as a conjunction, etc., should not be counted as errors. Next, a careful distinction was made between grammatical errors and mechanical errors. A grammatical error is an error which can be detected in either speaking or writing, such as the use of the uninflected noun plural, the incorrect pronoun case, and the lack of subject-verb agreement, whereas a mechanical error is one that only appears in writing, including errors in spelling, capitalization, or punctuation. For example, the dialectal usage "my brother book" is an error in noun possessive according to the standard norm, whereas "my brothers book," which sounds perfectly all right to the ear, is a violation of the convention of writing, which is an error in mechanics.

---

[23] Ednah Shepard Thomas, Evaluating Student Themes. (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1955).

The classification of each mechanical or grammatical error also needed to be clarified. Any error involving the omission of the hyphen, the use of the apostrophe, or the use of the period to indicate abbreviation was counted as a punctuation error. A group of two sentences punctuated as one was counted one error under run-on sentence, not two errors under punctuation and capitalization separately. As for grammatical errors, the use of "he go" was counted an error under subject-verb agreement when the context called for the present form, under verb tense when the preterit was in order. When a student kept shifting from the preterit to historical present and back, then the scorer had to use her own judgment to decide which tense was intended. The use of he could of gone for he could have gone, which strictly speaking is a spelling error since the unstressed have sounds like of to the ear, was counted as an error in verb form because the mistake stems from a lack of understanding in the use of verb forms. The omission of the copula was also counted an error in verb form. The same error repeated was counted as many times as it occurred.

In this manner a check list with each category clearly defined was worked out for the evaluation of the essay test. (See Appendix E.) Both mechanical and grammatical errors were tallied, though the statistical analysis included only the latter. Two staff members then checked fifteen essays independently, and their results were correlated. A correlation of .70 was considered significant enough to indicate substantial agreement between two independent scorers and sufficient reliability of the results. After the first year, it was considered adequate to have one scorer check all the essays and another scorer do some extensive rechecking.

Two observations stood out in the process of evaluating the essay tests. First, the two areas in which the scorers disagreed most frequently were punctuation and capitalization. In punctuation, some teachers had the tendency to require more punctuation marks than others. In capitalization, which often turned out to be a problem of handwriting, some teachers were more strict than others in requiring a certain size or style for the capital letter and in marking any deviation as incorrect. On the other hand, errors in grammar and usage according to the check list were so well defined that different scorers found little room to disagree or to require subjective judgment.

Secondly, each year the students made about three to five times as many errors in mechanics as in grammar, or 2-3 grammatical errors per hundred words as against 10-11 mechanical errors per hundred words. The students, on the average, could get rid of more than half of the mechanical errors at the end of the year, but only in 1962-63 could they do as well in eliminating their grammatical errors. (See Table 3.) Whether grammatical errors are more tenacious than mechanical errors because students come to college with more deeply ingrained dialectal habits than habits of writing remains to be explored.

In order to elicit certain grammatical patterns in the essay test, or at least to keep students from having too much freedom in choosing and confining themselves to a few patterns in which they were most competent, the staff felt that there should be a better control of the subject matter of the essay. To assign a topic apparently was not enough. Writing based on reading would become a test in reading as well as in writing. Finally, in the third year, the staff decided to try audio-visual aids. The students were shown a short narrative film which was preceded and followed by a brief discussion to make sure that they had not missed the main points of the story. They were then asked to write a narrative based on the film. The film shown in September, 1963, concerned the life and work of Alexander Graham Bell, and the one shown in May, 1964, was a story on telephone courtesy, both obtained from the Bell Telephone Company. Students liked the procedure because they did not have to worry about the subject matter or the vocabulary and could concentrate on communication form. The staff also found what they expected to find, that content control led, to some extent at least, to the control of usage patterns. Writing about Alexander Graham Bell, for example, seemed to produce fewer nonstandard patterns than writing about one's family. In addition, evaluation seemed simpler when the two essay tests were on a more comparable basis.

TABLE 3. COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN GRAMMATICAL ERRORS PER HUNDRED WORDS AND MECHANICAL ERRORS PER HUNDRED WORDS ON THE ESSAY TESTS ADMINISTERED IN ALL THREE YEARS OF THE PROJECT.

Year	Number of Students	Grammatical Errors Per Hundred Words				Mechanical Errors Per Hundred Words			
		Mean 1st Test	Mean 2nd Test	Mean Change	Percentage of Change	Mean 1st Test	Mean 2nd Test	Mean Change	Percentage of Change
1st Year	45*	2.16	1.67	.49	22.7%	10.61	5.86	4.75	44.8%
2nd Year	62	2.88	1.32	1.56	54.2%	10.22	5.64	4.58	44.8%
3rd Year	60	2.73	2.11	.62	22.7%	9.99	5.30	4.69	46.9%
Prog. I	28	2.61	2.28	.33	12.6%	10.04	5.06	4.98	49.6%
Prog. II	32	2.83	1.95	.88	31.1%	9.94	5.52	4.42	44.5%

---

*Actually 51 students remained with the project for the entire year in 1961-62, but six students, who registered late, did not take the initial essay test.

The only drawback in using a film to supply writing content was the necessary lengthening of the testing period. At the beginning of the school year, when a whole week was set aside for freshman orientation and for testing, it was easy enough to set aside 40-45 minutes for film showing and discussion. The final testing, unfortunately, posed a problem. Class schedules, work schedules (for work students), choir and band practices, etc., made it impossible for all the project students to come together except in the evening. After a regular day's work, the evening was not ideal for the essay test, which required about two hours to include film-showing, discussion, and writing. When the film projector ran into trouble, as it unfortunately did during the final testing, and the writing time was half an hour behind schedule, the students were obviously tired. Staff members believed that this was one of the factors which produced poorer performance in the third year than in the second year of the project.

Keeping in mind the limitation of forcing a subjective test into statistical data and the many factors that affect performance on an essay test, it may help to examine the nature of change and the circumstances under which changes took place in addition to the numerical figures of change.

A student, for example, entered the campus at the beginning of the freshman orientation week, full of anticipation and apprehension as to whether he could really fit into a college curriculum. He was subjected to a series of tests given by the English Department and by the Testing Committee. Even though these tests were primarily for the purpose of placement and guidance, he was afraid that poor performance might send him home immediately. He kept reminding himself that he was a college student now and must put his best foot forward in whatever he did. In the initial essay test, he wrote about 100 or 150 words very carefully, producing something with little substance and few grammatical errors. In the course of a year he learned, among other things, that college was not so formidable after all, and he could easily get by with a C or, with luck, a B or B-minus. The final essay test, when it came, was just another test among many. Complacent or bored, he rambled on and accumulated ten or fifteen "careless" errors, statistically offsetting the effort of three other students who gained three to five points each. Two or three such students in a class of 15, which was not an unusual phenomenon, could distort the picture of performance of the rest of the class completely.

Another student, one of the best in the experimental group in 1963-64, wrote 78 words with no grammatical errors in the first essay test, and 224 words with no grammatical errors in the final essay test. In the first essay he used three verbs, gave, worked, ended (simple past tense), the copula was three times, and not a single verb phrase. In the second essay he demonstrated his versatility in the use of the verb, including many incidents of the third person singular s ending, the use of the copulas is, are, won't be, might be, and the use of ten different past participle forms in verb phrases and verbal phrases. In his interviews, in which he made 16 mistakes in the use of the verb in September and only five in the following May, both his dialectal background and his progress were evident. On the essay tests, however, since he made no mistakes either time, he showed no progress statistically.

It is interesting to note that students had more difficulty with verb tense when they became more deeply involved in relating an interesting story. Many students, including some very good ones, kept shifting between the past tense and the historical present. At the Conference on Urban School Dialects and Language Learning held at Indiana University on August 3-5, 1964, the observation was made that confusion of the verb tenses was a reflection of the child's need to relive an experience in order to tell it. Whether the shift of tense shown in the final essay test of the project students reflected the same psychological need in these young adults (although they often referred to each other as "the children") is difficult to ascertain, but this kind of error, which occurred in many well written essays, is certainly different from the types of errors that were scattered throughout a perfunctorily written essay.

Because of successful content control through the use of films to provide subject matter for writing, 60 students used the double construction only once (double comparison) in the final essay test. Among a total of 306 grammatical errors made in the first essay test, 35.3% were in the category of nouns while 57.8% were in the category of verbs. The rest included 3.6% in the use of pronoun, primarily pronoun reference, and 3% in the use of adjectives for adverbs. In the final essay test, which showed a total of 299 errors, only 17% were in the category of nouns, 69.6% were in the category of verbs, mostly verb tense, 10.4% in pronoun, primarily pronoun reference, and 2.7% in the use of adjective vs. adverb. (See Table 4.) In other words, percentagewise, the students had more difficulty with the verb and the pronoun or, more accurately, with verb tense and pronoun reference, in the second essay than in

TABLE 4. PERCENTAGE OF THE TYPES OF ERRORS OCCURRING ON THE ESSAY TESTS ADMINISTERED TO 60 PROJECT STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER, 1963, AND MAY, 1964.

	INITIAL ESSAY TEST September 1963							FINAL ESSAY TEST May 1964				
Class	Double Constructions	Noun	Verb	Pron.	Adj.-Adv.	Total	Double Constructions	Noun	Verb	Pron.	Adj.-Adv.	Total
B-1	1	32	34	2	1	70	0	14	47	8	0	69
B-2	0	20	31	3	4	58	0	12	46	12	2	72
Program I	1	52	65	5	5	128	0	26	93	20	2	141
Percentage	1%	40%	51%	4%	4%	100%	0%	18.5%	66%	14%	1.5%	100%
B-3	0	23	49	4	2	78	1	5	36	5	1	48
B-4	0	33	63	2	2	100	0	20	79	6	5	110
Program II	0	56	112	6	4	178	1	25	115	11	6	158
Percentage	0%	31.5%	63%	3.4%	2.1%	100%	.6%	15.8%	72.8%	7%	3.8%	100%
All Groups	1	108	177	11	9	306	1	51	208	31	8	299
Percentage	.3%	35.3%	57.8%	3.6%	3%	100%	.3%	17%	69.6%	10.4%	2.7%	100%

the first essay. They seemed to have little difficulty with double constructions and pronoun case form in either essay test, and they made marked progress in the handling of noun plural and noun possessive.

It is also interesting to note that, in the final essay test in May, 1964, most students did an almost perfect job in the first half of the essay and broke down around or after the midpoint, when they perhaps became a little tired or became more and more deeply involved in the excitement of the story. It seems, even in writing, to know how to use standard English is one thing, to be able to use it without conscious sustained effort is another. To achieve the latter goal will be a continuous challenge to our students in many years to come, but to achieve the former is a promising first step which demonstrates that they are not crippled.

C. The Interview

Each project student was required to have a personal interview with a designated member of the project staff at the beginning and near the end of the school year so that his speech patterns before and after pattern practice exercises could be measured. These interviews, which lasted about 15 minutes each, were recorded on tapes. During the first year of the project, it was believed that, in order to make results comparable, all students must be asked the same set of questions during the interview. It was soon found, however, that this procedure could not be used with a close knit group on a small campus. Students soon found out all the questions and came prepared. Even when alternate sets of questions were used, as in the final interviews of the first year, students still came with well prepared answers.

The greatest problem in conducting the interview was getting the students to talk naturally, or to talk at all. Shy and diffident, most students were afraid to talk, particularly when they had to face the instructor and the tape recorder in a situation strange to them. Some students did not show up for the interview as scheduled. Consciously or unconsciously, they just "forgot," and the interviews had to be rescheduled, sometimes more than once. Some came dutifully but were reluctant to talk, giving scanty responses in spite of a great deal of prodding from the interviewer. Many spoke in such low voices that the microphone failed to register the words, and it was necessary to start the interviews all over to get audible tapes. The two classroom teachers and the language laboratory assistant did their best to explain the meaning of the interview, but the students' resistance or inhibition was too strong to break down easily. As a result, it took a long time, sometimes well over a month, to complete a set of interviews. Most students already had had two to four weeks of laboratory practice before they had their initial interviews, a delay highly undesirable since the purpose of the initial interview was to discover the students' speech patterns preceding pattern practice. It also affected the morale of both the interviewer and the students.

The interviewer played an important role in the interviewing situation. The interviewer of the first year, who had a good speech background, believed that dialectal problems were primarily problems of pronunciation and enunciation. The interview, from her viewpoint, was a means of eliciting words that Negro students often mispronounced; such as ruther for rather, shore for sure, skeer for scare, sech for such, drownded for drowned, fillum for film, athalete for athlete, chilren for children, etc. She composed paragraphs using these and other target words and asked the student to read them aloud, then asked questions based on the paragraphs. This reading part of the interview may have contributed to the tenseness of the students, particularly those who did not read well or had little confidence in their ability to read. The extremely correct English of the interviewer was also in direct contrast to the speech of the students, which may have made them more keenly aware of their inadequacy.

The interviewer during the second year (the first one left the college after the first year) was convinced that the students' dialect problems stemmed mainly from nonstandard grammatical usage. She also believed that the purpose of the project was to sever the students completely from their dialectal background. Dissatisfied with the students' "avoidance techniques" in the initial interviews, during which students avoided direct answers to evade a pattern which they feared, or stalled for time in order to prepare a "classroom reply," the interviewer did her best in the final interviews, and sometimes quite successfully, to put the students at ease so that they could speak "naturally." She chatted with them in a casual manner about their families and personal experiences to find out how well they could use standard English in a "natural" way. Unfortunately, when the students found that they were expected to be natural, most became so relaxed that they reverted to their natural speech, which was the local dialect. Some students resented the personal questions. A few, for one reason or another, never came for the final interview.

This did not mean a lack of planning on the part of the staff. In fact, the staff held lengthy meetings once a week in which all plans and procedures were discussed and approved before they were put to practice. Plans, however, were no more than outline guides. Those who actually did the job had to follow their own judgment and did it the way they considered best. Perhaps, too, we as "experienced" English teachers had a way of oversimplifying both the students and the subject matter of English and had to be shocked into realizing that students are thinking and feeling human beings, not just subjects to be taught and to be tested. And English, far from just another subject matter, is a set of social behaviors behind which lies a fine mesh of psychological complexes and human feelings.

Two other ways of interviewing the students were tried at the beginning of the second year. One we called machine interviewing, in which the questions were taped and an entire class of students, using individual booths, listened to the questions and recorded their answers in a single class period. The problem with this kind of interview was similar to that encountered in interviews by the instructor using the same set of questions. Even though the period of conducting the interviews was shortened from several weeks to one day, many students in the other three classes responded with prepared instead of impromptu answers. Some students, without the prodding of the interviewer, left many questions unanswered. Others produced completely inaudible tapes.

The second way involved having two students make a team and carry on a free conversation which was tape recorded. This kind of conversation brought free, enthusiastic responses, but, more often than not, the conversation was monopolized by the more dominant partner. In addition, since it was done at the very beginning of the year, many students had not learned to operate the tape recorder well enough to produce clearly audible tapes. This method, however, was promising and could have been further explored if time had permitted the development of better control of the interviewing situation.

If the interviews during the first two years of the project did not yield the desired results, they triggered valuable discussions among staff members which resulted in a better insight into the factors that affected the students' speech performance and effected a clarification of the main objective of the project.

Correct pronunciation and enunciation, for example, are matters that every English teacher must teach. But which variations in pronunciation are incidental mistakes? Which represent a dialectal pattern? Which are purely regional variations, and which are legitimate slurring or reduction of vowel in the normal flow or cadence of speech? Answers to such questions must first be ascertained before a teacher can label variations as incorrect and insist that the students change them. Every English teacher has a few pet ideas as to what standard English is or should be, but, pending extensive research to determine which allophones in the phonemic system of American English are regional and which are truly nonstandard,[24] the staff decided that no attempt should be made to change the students' pronunciation or "southern accent" unless it was clearly erroneous, such as ax for ask and athalete for athlete; or socially unacceptable, such as dis for this and dat for that; or confusing the phonemes and causing difficulty in communication, such as sin for sing or rat for right. Students, however, should be helped to understand the principles of speech articulation and to cultivate the habit of speaking clearly and with confidence. In the evaluation of the students' ability to use standard English in the interviews, the staff decided that emphasis should be given to standard structural patterns, which after the work of many structural linguists are more or less clearly defined, rather than to one particular variety of standard pronunciation to the exclusion of many other acceptable variations, especially in vowel qualities.

---

[24] Research currently being conducted at the University of Chicago under the direction of Professor Raven I. McDavid should yield helpful data concerning these points.

The staff also realized, slowly and painfully, that they set an impossible goal if they attempted to sever the students completely from their dialectal background in the course of nine months. Some staff members were deeply frustrated and hurt when they discovered that students used the local dialect as soon as they left the language laboratory. Some doubted that the experiment could ever succeed. The discussions, however, gradually shifted emphasis. Instead of asking whether it was possible to win the students completely away from their dialect in nine months, the staff, with the help of the consultants, began to ask whether it was necessary or desirable to do so. The idea of teaching standard English as a second language returned, not as a matter of techniques, but as a reasonable and psychologically sound objective to be achieved. It was again difficult for staff members, all of whom had been through the mill of traditional grammar, to accept standard English as a second language to be added to, but not to replace, the students' nonstandard dialect; but the more they worked with the students, the more they were convinced that to help the students establish control of standard English patterns in addition to their dialect patterns was not only realistic, but also worthwhile. Then, instead of worrying when students used the dialect on the campus, they had the satisfaction of observing that some students did make an attempt to use standard English outside the language laboratory and the classrooms.

With a clearer view of what was to be accomplished, the staff decided that the interviews must be conducted in an entirely different manner during the final year of the project.

First, to shorten the distance between the interviewer and the interviewee, the interview should not be conducted by an instructor, who is an authority symbol to the students. Instead, the language laboratory assistant, who was closer to the students in age and in cultural background, and who had had extensive experience working with Negro youth in informal situations, was assigned the job. She was given plenty of time to prepare for this task. She listened to all the interviews previously recorded, taking notes on the ways students reacted to different types of questions and experimenting with the microphone and the tape recorder to determine in what way they could produce the best results without calling too much attention to them. Instead of having one microphone placed on the table, the interviewer and the interviewee each would have one around the neck so that the two did not need to sit close together to have their voices registered.

In order to establish rapport with the students, the assistant met the freshmen during their orientation week, even before they were selected for the project. She chatted with them and helped them get adjusted, so that when the time came for the interviews, she was not a stranger to them.

Secondly, all interviews must be done within a period of about one week at the very beginning and end of the school year. The laboratory assistant, the only person working full time for the project, would put aside all other duties to concentrate on the interviews. No laboratory sessions would begin until all initial interviews were completed, and all sessions would end when the final interviews began.

Thirdly, the interviewer would help the students feel relaxed and comfortable, but she would also make clear that standard English would be expected of them.

Lastly, to make the interview more realistic, the student must have something to talk about which should be neither personal nor outside his experience span. Just as the film was used to supply writing matter for the essay test, three pictures cut from old magazines were shown to each student. He could talk about the one of his choice. Each set of three pictures must represent a variety of subjects: a natural scene, a scene of human activities or relations, and a work of art. To get the student settled and relaxed, casual questions about the student's hometown and his high school or campus experiences were asked before the pictures were introduced.

As it turned out, the students made no attempt to prepare for the interview when they expected to discuss various pictures. Even though the introductory questions were practically the same for everyone, the answers seemed original rather than prepared. The students kept their appointments, and the interviews concluded in scheduled time. All the tapes came out much clearer than those recorded in previous years, although most students were still visibly (or audibly) tense. Some students, too anxious to speak correctly in the second interview, ended up with more mistakes. Some became over correct, and added a grammatical ending where it did not belong.

The technical problem of recording, unfortunately, still existed. Although the tape recorder used for interviewing was a reasonably good brand, it did not always register the consonant endings very clearly, particularly when the student's voice was weak or hesitant. One interviewer who reviewed the tapes reported that the tape recorder did not catch some of the endings when students "spoke with tension or with little lip movement." Two reviewers who checked the same tapes independently often came out with very different results. Even when they listened together, and turned the tape back and forth to listen to a phrase or sentence repeatedly, they still could not agree whether the student said two apple or apples, he had or he have, he go or he'd go, I be or I'll be. In connection with the double subject, one interviewer thought the student used a double subject when he answered a question about his father's occupation and said, "My father, he is a farmer." Another reviewer, however, believed that the student merely echoed what the interviewer said as if thinking aloud, paused, and then started the answer with a pronoun; which means that the noun and the pronoun actually belonged to two separate utterances and should not be taken as a double subject. The student's intention is entirely a matter of interpretation.

Even the same reviewer was not always consistent with herself, as evidenced by the fact that her reviewing of the same tape at two different times did not always produce similar results. The fluctuation of human attention on a job that requires a high degree of sustained concentration is another factor that must be taken into account.

The attitude of the reviewers may make a difference. While the more sympathetic reviewer may give the student the benefit of the doubt when she is not sure, the more exact reviewer may insist on absolutely "correct" pronunciation. Take the phrase "used to," for example. Evans and Evans noted that "In speech the *d* of *used* merges with the *t* of *to* and the two words are always pronounced *use to*.[25] The reviewer of our students' tapes, who had probably corrected *use to* many times in students' themes, counted an error unless she heard two distinctly separated alveolar stops. Similarly, when a verb with an *s* ending was followed by a word beginning with an *s* sound, the reviewer would count a mistake if she did not hear two distinct *s*'s or a clear break in the middle of a prolonged sibilant sound. Even the same reviewer may assume a different attitude at a different time or in a different mood. All these variables crept into the picture and made the interviews extremely difficult to evaluate with confidence. Consequently, even though a great deal of the staff's effort and time had been consumed in an attempt to turn the interviews into reasonably reliable statistical data, they finally agreed that more time might be needed, or more research done, before this could be accomplished.

On the other hand, it was clear from comparing the initial and the final interviews of the final year that the students had gained a sensitivity to language usage which they did not previously have. In the initial interviews they were more hesitant and unsure. In the final interviews they often corrected themselves when they made a mistake. Many could use standard English fluently in greater stretches and with apparent confidence until they lost control and produced a cluster of errors. Almost all students showed considerable progress in enunciation. Many students, at the end of their final interviews, expressed their appreciation of the project. Some suggested that the project should continue for the benefit of other students.

---

[25] Bergan Evans and Cornelia Evans, *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usages* (Random House, 1957), p. 533.

CHAPTER V: ANALYSIS OF DATA

The first year of the project was devoted primarily to the development of methods, materials, and procedures, both for instruction and evaluation. Although considerable analysis was attempted, its purpose was to test the evaluation methods rather than to show instructional results. The statistical findings of the first year, therefore, are not included in this chapter.

For 1962-63 and 1963-64, three types of comparison are made: the initial and final test scores each year are compared to measure student changes; the results of three tests are compared; and the achievement of the experimental group is compared with that of the control group in the final year. A comparison is also made between the scores of the project group (the B or average group) and that of the non-project groups, both Group A (high level) and Group C (low level), on tests administered in September to all freshmen. The comparison of Groups A, B, and C in September each year is based on the total Cooperative English Tests and the local grammar test, while the data for project students alone are based on the Cooperative English Tests, using both the Total English scores (including Reading Comprehension) and the English Expression scores[26] (excluding Reading Comprehension), the local grammar test, and an essay test scored in terms of numbers of grammatical errors per hundred words. Scores of mechanical errors on the essay test are not included in the statistics; nor are scores on the local spelling test. Neither has any bearing on grammar-usage drills. The interview scores, which were expected to be most significant in the evaluation of speech performance, can not be included because both human and mechanical limitations have combined to make reliable scoring almost impossible to attain.

---

[26] All CET scores are converted scores.

In the tabulation of data, only those students who completed the entire year's work are included.

In 1962-63, the statistical analysis is based on 62 students in the project or Group B (average) as compared with 40 students in Group A (high level) and 28 in Group C (low level). In 1963-64, it is based on 60 project students (Group B) as compared with 43 students in Group A and 13 in Group C. The mean CET score of the project group at the time of college entrance is slightly higher in 1962-63 (139.24) than in 1963-64 (138.5) as are the mean scores of the other groups on the same test (149.03 in September, 1962, and 148.09 in September, 1963, for Group A, and 130.11 in September, 1962, and 129.23 in September, 1963, for Group C.). On the local grammar test, on the other hand, all groups made higher mean scores in September, 1963, than in September, 1962.

It should also be noted that the project group, or the so-called average group, clearly leans toward the below average scale at the beginning of each year, more so in the final year. In September, 1962, its mean score of 139.24 is about one point below the mean score of 140.29 for all three groups. In September, 1963, its mean score of 138.5 is about two and a half points below the mean scores of 141.02 for all three groups. (See Tables 5 and 6.)

For 62 project students, the initial test scores in September, 1962, have a range of 127-155 (possible range: 114-168) and a mean of 139.24 on the CET, Total English; on the English Expression alone the range is 124-155 (possible range: 109-160) and the mean is 139.57; and on the local grammar test it is 3-33 (possible range: 0-50) and the mean is 15.32. On the essay test, seven students made no grammatical errors, while one made as many as 12 grammatical errors per hundred words. The mean is 2.88. (See Table 7.)

These students, retested in May, 1963, show a mean gain of 4.81 (from 139.24 to 144.05) on the CET, Total English, 5.94 (139.57 -145.51) on English Expression alone, 13 (15.3-28.3) on the local grammar test, and 1.56 (2.88-2.23 EPHW)[27] on the essay test. All these gains are significant at the .0005 level. (See Table 8.)

In 1963-64, 60 project students were divided into two experimental classes, B-1 and B-2, and two control classes, B-3 and B-4, with 30 students (completing the course) in the experimental group, or Program I as we call it, and 32 students in the control group, or Program II. Statistics, therefore, are computed on the basis of Program I versus Program II as well as on the entire project group.

On the initial tests given in September, 1963, Program I or the experimental group scored a mean of 139.72 (range: 133-154) or about 2.2 points above the mean score of 137.44 for Program II or the control group (range: 131-145) on the CET, Total English. On English Expression alone, Program I also scored higher with a mean of 139.36, or 2.8 points above the mean of 136.56 for Program II, and had a range of 132.15 as compared with Program II's 129.15. On the local grammar test, Program I shows a mean of 18.18 (range: 6-29) or less than half a point higher than Program II's

---

[27] EPHW stands for errors per hundred words.

17.72 (range: 9-31). On the essay test, Program I students made an average of 2.61 errors per hundred words as compared with 2.83 errors per hundred words made by Program II students. However, the student with the poorest results on the essay test in Program I made as many as 11.02 EPHW as compared with the poorest in Program II, who made only 7.41 EPHW.

Although students were placed at random in the two experimental and the two control classes, a number of late comers and withdrawals after placement or registration made it necessary to modify the original placement in order to fit students into the heavy laboratory schedules. It is obvious, on the basis of statistical evidence, that the experimental students scored slightly higher than the control students on all tests when school began. (See Table 9.)

According to the results of retesting in May, 1964, both the experimental group and the control group show significant change on all tests except the essay test for the experimental group. The experimental group did only slightly better on the CET, Total English, showing a mean change of 3.11 while the mean change for the control group was 3.03. It scored lower than the control group on all other tests, with a mean change of 4.71 in contrast to the control's 5.13 on English Expression, a mean change of 10.32 contrasting with the control's 10.34 on the local grammar test, a mean change of .33 fewer grammatical errors per hundred words contrasting with the control's .88 fewer grammatical EPHW on the essay test. (See Table 10.)

It may be interesting to note that, since the experimental group scored slightly higher than the control group at the beginning of the year, it remained higher at the end (except for the essay test) in spite of the greater gain of the control group. On the final tests, it scored a mean of 142.83 in contrast with the control's mean of 140.47 on the CET Total English; a mean of 144.07 as against the control's 141.69 on English Expression; and a mean of 28.50 in contrast with the control's 28.06 on the local grammar test. On the essay test, however, its mean is 2.28 grammatical EPHW in contrast with the control's 1.95 EPHW.

The lack of significant differences between test results of the two groups may be due to the fact that there was little difference in the two instructional and practice programs. As mentioned earlier in this report, the two programs were very much the same except for one variable, the use of pattern practice by the experimental group. This one difference may have been further obscured by the fact that one instructor, who was responsible for teaching one experimental class and one control class, and the laboratory assistant, who was in charge of laboratory practice for both programs, were both new members of the project staff during the final year of operation. They often wished that they could have joined the project earlier and had had a better understanding of the experiment. Another factor was the obvious Hawthorne effect shown in the control group. During the first year of the project, all project students were greatly stimulated by the novelty of the language laboratory and by the attention lavished on them, and the Hawthorne effect was apparently at work. When the experiment progressed through the second into the final year, however, this effect gradually wore off for the experimental students, and it was the control group, who felt that they were being studied while at the same time being deprived of the benefit of the language laboratory, who seemed to make an extra effort to prove that they were as good as the others and deserved as much as the others.

The better showing of the control group on the essay test may have reflected that group's extensive experience in story telling and writing. The experimental group, emphasizing pattern practice, did more oral drills in unrelated sentences using the same pattern. While the control group excelled in writing, however, they did not do as well in reading as the experimental group even though they spent more time in reading and in discussions based on reading. This may suggest that pattern practice has helped the experimental students in the understanding of the structure of English which may lead to better reading comprehension.

Project students in 1962-63 showed greater changes than those in 1963-64. While the mean changes in the final year are significant at the .05, .01, or .0005 level, those in the second year are all significant at the .0005 level. Since the project students in 1962-63 spent all their practice sessions in the language laboratory doing tape-recorded drills, whereas the experimental students in 1963-64 devoted much of their time to role-playing activities and small-group practice, greater score changes in 1962-63 suggest that more extensive use of the language laboratory may have contributed to greater effectiveness of the pattern practice techniques. On the other hand, the performance of the project students in 1963-64 may have been affected by their tension and distraction occasioned by the prolonged race movement in Orangeburg throughout the year and by the death of President Kennedy, which deeply hurt the morale of the students for many weeks.

It should be further pointed out that the initial scores of both years' project students on the three tests show little correlation to one another, and the correlation of changes is also low.

The correlation of students' scores on the CET, Total English, and the local grammar test for September, 1962, is .27 and for September, 1963, is .17. On English Expression and the local grammar test it is slightly higher, .56 for September, 1962, and .41 for September, 1963, but not high enough to be significant. The correlation of the essay test with the CET, Total English, is .58 and with English Expression .37 for 1962, and .20, .26, respectively, for 1963; while the correlation of the local grammar test and the essay test is .24 for 1962, and .36 for 1963.

The correlation of changes as evidenced in the final tests is even lower. The scores of May, 1963, show a correlation of .27 between the CET--Total English and the local grammar test, .40 between the CET--English Expression and the local grammar test, .11 between the CET--Total English and the essay test, .13 between English Expression and the essay test, and .11 between the essay test and the local grammar test. The scores of May, 1964, show a still lower correlation, namely, .08 for the CET--Total English and the local grammar test; .002 for the CET--English Expression and the local grammar test; .13 for the CET--Total English and the essay test, .22 for English Expression and the essay test; and .003 between the local grammar test and the essay test.

This lack of correlation, beyond any doubt, shows that the different tests used for the evaluation of the project did not measure the same thing. The Cooperative English Tests--Total English scores take into consideration the reading ability of the students while the English Expression test measures not only the students' ability to recognize errors in grammar and usage but also the students' previous experience with standardized testing. The chance element in all purely objective tests must also be taken into consideration. The local grammar test, which does not call the student's attention to any part of the sentence, but requires him to pinpoint a mistake in a number of possible places, calls for a greater awareness and a more exact knowledge of grammar and usage. The essay test, which is a production test rather than a recognition test, measures not only the students' knowledge of grammar but also his ability to apply sustained effort and effective control of his language patterns.

The correlation thus is greatly affected not by the group norm but by the fluctuation of student performance. On the CET, for instance, five students regressed from 1 to 5 points in 1962-63, while six students in the experimental group regressed 1 to 5 points and six more in the control group regressed 1 to 7 points in 1963-64. Some students in both years gained as many as 10-14 points. On English Expression, ten students dropped 1-11 points in 1962-63, while six experimental students dropped 1-7 points and seven control students dropped 1-11 points in 1963-64. On the other hand, some students in the second year gained as many as 20 points and some in the third year gained as many as 16 points.

No student regressed on the local grammar test. Only one student in 1962-63 made no change in score, and forty-eight out of sixty-two students gained 10-20 points. In 1963-64, all students progressed on the local grammar test. More than half increased their scores by 10 points or more, and some increased as many as 25 points. These highly significant changes, which testify to the keen awareness of the students not evident on the CET scores, may have contributed to the low correlation between the two sets of scores.

On the essay test, a slackening of attention or effort on the part of the student could easily causes an aggregate of careless mistakes at a time when the student's control of standard patterns was not yet firmly established. It is also misleading to count errors when the purpose of the test was to measure the student's ability to use standard patterns. While it is easy in an objective test to know the number of correct answers by counting the number of incorrect answers, the same procedure cannot be applied to the evaluation of the essay test with an equal assurance of accuracy. Until a way is found to count the number of correct patterns used, however, counting errors per hundred words provides a practical way of measuring what is basically difficult to measure quantitatively, namely, the students' performance in language usage. It is this basic difference between the essay test and the objective tests which accounts for the low correlation shown between them.

In conclusion, the statistical findings reflect, to a certain extent, what the project did or did not do, as well as some of the factors that entered into the picture; they also show the limitations of our present evaluation devices and procedures. From the widespread concern for the English skills of the younger generation, in general, and in culturally or linguistically different youth, in particular, since Dr. Squire's publication on The National Interest and The Teaching of English, it is apparent that a more effective method of measuring the speaking and writing ability of students must be found.

TABLE 5. MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF SCORES ON TWO TESTS ADMINISTERED TO ALL ENTERING FRESHMEN IN SEPTEMBER, 1962.

Group	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS		LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST		NUMBER OF STUDENTS
	Mean Scores	S. D.	Mean Scores	S. D.	
A (high)	149.03	5.43	25.98	7.82	40
B (average)	139.24	4.78	15.37	9.14	62
C (low)	130.11	3.78	6.82	3.69	28
All Groups	140.29	8.28	16.77	9.91	130

TABLE 6. MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF SCORES ON TWO TESTS ADMINISTERED TO FRESHMEN IN SEPTEMBER, 1963.

GROUP	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS		LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST		NUMBER OF STUDENTS
	Mean Scores	S. D.	Mean Scores	S. D.	
A	148.09	6.41	28.14	7.35	43
B	138.5	4.46	17.93	7.74	60
C	129.23	3.55	12.31	5.02	13
Totals	141.02	8.01	21.09	8.43	116

TABLE 7. MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF SCORES OF PROJECT STUDENTS ON THREE TESTS ADMINISTERED IN SEPTEMBER, 1962.

COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS				LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST		ESSAY TEST			
Total English		English Expression				Number of Words		Errors Per 100 Words	
Mean Score	S. D.	Mean Score	S. D.	Mean Score	S. D.	Mean Number of Words	S. D.	Mean Number of Errors	S. D.
139.24	4.78	139.57	6.10	15.32	7.55	140.87	36.07	2.88	2.56

TABLE 8. MEAN CHANGE, STANDARD ERROR OF MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF CHANGES IN SCORES ON THREE TESTS ADMINISTERED IN SEPTEMBER, 1962, AND MAY, 1963, TO PROJECT STUDENTS.

COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS						LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST			ESSAY TEST			NUMBER OF STUDENTS
Total English			English Expression									
Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	
*** 4.81	.51	4.02	*** 5.94	.64	6.28	*** 13.00	.78	6.10	*** 1.56	.12	2.76	62

***Significant at .0005 level.

TABLE 9. MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF SCORES FOR PROJECT GROUPS ON THREE TESTS ADMINISTERED IN SEPTEMBER, 1963.

GROUP	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS				LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST		ESSAY TEST		NUMBER OF STUDENTS
	Total English		English Expression				Errors Per 100 Words		
	Mean Scores	S. D.	Mean Scores	S. D.	Mean Scores	S. D.	Mean Scores	S. D.	
Program 1	139.72	4.83	139.36	5.04	18.18	6.40	2.61	2.66	28
B-1	140.07	5.38	139.57	4.82	18.43	7.04	2.64	2.85	14
B-2	139.36	4.38	139.14	5.43	17.93	5.93	2.59	1.58	14
Program 2	137.44	3.86	136.56	5.50	17.72	4.95	2.83	1.80	32
B-3	137.88	3.90	136.81	5.36	18.38	5.52	2.71	1.69	16
B-4	137.00	3.91	136.31	5.81	17.06	4.49	2.96	1.94	16
All Groups	138.5	4.46	137.87	5.43	17.93	7.74	2.73	2.05	60

TABLE 10. MEAN CHANGE, STANDARD ERROR OF MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF CHANGES IN SCORES ON THREE TESTS ADMINISTERED TO PROJECT STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER, 1963, AND MAY, 1964.

	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS						LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST			ESSAY TEST			NUMBER OF STUDENTS
	Total English			English Expression									
	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	Mean Change	S. E. of Mean	S. D.	
Program 1	*** +3.11	.76	4.01	*** 4.71	1.26	6.64	*** +10.32	.84	4.45	+ .33	.45	2.37	28
B-1	** +3.71	1.14	4.29	** 4.86	1.80	6.74	*** +11.86	.93	3.61	+ .67	.64	2.39	14
B-2	* +2.50	1.01	3.78	* 4.57	1.76	6.58	*** + 8.79	1.21	4.76	- .02	.65	2.41	14
Program 2	** +3.03	.75	4.26	*** 5.13	1.13	6.42	*** +10.34	.95	5.40	** + .88	.27	1.52	32
B-3	** +3.56	1.18	4.57	** 5.69	1.69	6.76	*** +12.00	1.52	6.09	** +1.23	.40	1.59	16
B-4	* +2.50	1.00	4.00	** 4.56	1.56	6.23	*** + 8.69	1.04	4.16	+ .53	.35	1.42	16
All Groups	*** 3.07	.53	4.11	*** 4.93	.83	6.42	*** +10.33	.64	4.93	** .62	.25	1.97	60

* Significant at the .05 level.
** Significant at the .01 level.
*** Significant at the .0005 level.

TABLE 11. CORRELATION OF TESTS ADMINISTERED TO PROJECT STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER, 1962.

		COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS		LOCAL GRAMMAR	ESSAY*
		Total English	English Expression		
C E T	(Total English)	1.00	----	.27	.58
	(English Expression)	----	1.00	.56	.37
LOCAL GRAMMAR		.27	.56	1.00	.24
ESSAY*		.58	.37	.24	1.00

*Essay scores are based on errors per 100 words.

TABLE 12. CORRELATION OF TESTS ADMINISTERED TO PROJECT STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER, 1963.

	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS		LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST	ESSAY TEST*
	Total English	English Expression		
CET - Total English	1.00	----	.17	.20
CET - English Expression	----	1.00	.41	.26=
Local Grammar Test	.17	.41	1.00	.36
Essay Test*	.20	.26	.36	1.00

*Essay scores are based on errors per 100 words.

TABLE 13. CORRELATION OF CHANGE SCORES ON THREE TESTS ADMINISTERED TO PROJECT STUDENTS IN SEPTEMBER, 1962, AND MAY, 1963.

	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS		LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST	ESSAY TEST
	Total English	English Expression		
CET - Total English	1.00	----	.27	.11
CET - English Expression	----	1.00	.40	.13
Local Grammar Test	.27	.40	1.00	.11
Essay Test	.11	.13	.11	1.00

TABLE 14. CORRELATION OF CHANGE SCORES FOR ALL PROJECT GROUPS ON THREE TESTS ADMINISTERED IN SEPTEMBER, 1963, AND MAY, 1964.

	COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TESTS		LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST	ESSAY TEST
	Total English	English Expression		
CET - Total English	1.00	----	.08	.13
CET - English Expression	----	1.00	.002	.22
Local Grammar Test	.08	.002	1.00	.003
Essay Test	.13	.22	.003	1.00

CHAPTER VI: EXAMPLES OF STUDENT CHANGE

In order not to lose sight of the human factors which underlie a form of behavior as subtle and capricious as speech performance, a few case studies have been attempted to show what actually happened to some of the students as they were propelled or thwarted by a cross current of social interactions, attitudes, and feelings not all of which they could fully understand.

Of the six students chosen for observation or study, only one was a project student in 1962-63. Four--two men and two women--belonged to two different experimental classes in 1963-64, and the other one was from a control group. The staff, understandably, was more interested in seeing how pattern practice worked or failed to work on different types of students. The case of Connie[28] from the control group, however, is a unique one. Connie's speech patterns were so extremely dialectal and so conspicuously different from those used by the other freshmen that the staff wanted to know what development she would achieve without the benefit of pattern practice.

Susan's case (1962-63) shows what the project could do for a student who was determined to get the best out of it, while Alice's case shows that the shy, modest, but conscientious individual could also be benefited.

The other three exemplify the importance of attitude in language behavior. Tommy never accepted the fact that he had a dialect problem, or that he needed any practice or drill. He strove to impress upon people how well he could talk. When he lost control and broke down before an audience, he gave up completely. Roseanne also tried to impress people that she was superior. She knew all about grammar but had firm dialect habits. It was almost the end of the year before she learned to hear how she herself talked, and began to watch her speech in the attempt to change her dialect habits. Willie, extremely inhibited and withdrawn, seemed to be the last person to be benefited by the project. He lost almost an entire semester before he found out that he could talk and enjoy talking. When he left the project, he was confident that he could, and determined that he would do well in the use of standard English.

---

[28] All of the students' names used in this chapter are fictitious.

We wish we could have these students a little longer; we hope they will go on now that we have set them in motion.

Case 1: Connie (Control Group, 1963-64)

Connie began the school year with her prospective major already decided: English. While in high school she took an active part in the dramatics and home economics clubs, but English was her first love.

Getting her to talk was no problem in her first interview. She seemed confident that her speech was above reproach and elaborated with ease and relish on a wide variety of subjects. It was amazing to see how much confidence she had in herself and in her speech, which, unfortunately contained markedly substandard patterns. Patterns like *I really doesn't know*.... *You does*.... *You is*.... *He have*.... *We has*..., which other freshmen used very rarely, were quite natural with her.

Connie had a serious problem in pronunciation instead of enunciation, as many other students had. It is possible that she was too confident of herself to feel the need to consult the dictionary. Connie read a great deal and often volunteered to make oral book reports. Quite often her pronunciation bore little resemblance to the words she meant to use. She could pronounce a word correctly when she heard the right pronunciation, which showed that her problem did not stem from inability to hear the difference or poor listening. On the other hand, her mispronunciation was so habitual that she seldom remembered to pronounce words correctly, particularly when she became involved in a group discussion.

As the year progressed, Connie volunteered less and less frequently in class although she would respond readily when called on by the instructor. Her enthusiasm did not greatly diminish, but her confidence did. She listened with an almost painful attention to the instructor and her classmates. At times a look of consternation would appear on her face. After a while it became evident to the instructor that Connie had developed a blank expression to prevent drawing notice to herself. She became increasingly timid in speech, and her efforts to think before speaking were obvious.

In her second interview, Connie exercised greater care and often corrected herself. She explained that she still loved English, and had enjoyed the year's work. She admitted that she had become aware of her inadequacies in English. "My grades wasn't as good as I expected," she said, "but I've improved."

Conscientious and diligent, Connie made sincere and conscious efforts to rid herself of her poor speech habits as she became aware of them. It is unfortunate that Connie happened to be in the control group and did not have the benefit of pattern practice, which she greatly needed.

Case 2: Susan (Experimental Group, 1962-63)

Susan was a project student during the second year of the project. She was one of those who worked diligently in the language laboratory and genuinely appreciated the opportunity to improve her English. By the end of nine months, Susan had acquired a firm habit of enunciating her words so distinctly and meticulously that her speech gave an impression of artificiality. She achieved, in the meantime, an increasing command of standard English with its many inflective forms.

Susan was born in the southeastern section of South Carolina. She lives with her parents, three brothers and five sisters. One brother is a mechanic. All the other children except a baby sister are in high school or grade school. Two sisters live in New York, one studying in school, the other working as a telephone operator. The family, though large, is a close knit group. They go to church together and often go on picnics or play games together. In a theme entitled "The Person I Admire Most," Susan wrote about her mother. Among other things, she remembered the cakes and pies her mother made. While at home, Susan helped with the cooking, washing, and ironing.

The indulgence of Susan's family and relatives can further be seen in some of her answers to a questionnaire. Asked whether her parents would be pleased when she used correct grammar at home, she said, "...my parents will be very much pleased, because they said I may be able to influence my little brothers and sisters to speak correct English as they grow up." Asked whether she ever corrected her parents and elders in English usage and what their reactions were, she answered, "Yes, I have corrected my parents and elders when they used incorrect grammar, and my parents are pleased that I do, but sometimes the elders would say that I am trying to be grown up too soon."

To view a child's growth in language mastery as a form of growing up is an insight that perhaps has a great deal to do with Susan's positive attitude towards her own language problems.

Susan visited Philadelphia in 1956 and New York in 1957. She also worked in New York the summer before she entered college in 1962. Her ambition now is to become a laboratory technician.

In school Susan did well by working conscientiously. She said that she always went to the dormitory after classes to do her assignments while they were fresh in her mind. She also related that her favorite teacher in high school--the one who taught two of her favorite subjects, mathematics and home economics--had told her that hard work was the key to success, and that her teacher's conviction had become hers ever since.

In the language laboratory, Susan was always prompt and eager. When many students fell behind in recording because of mechanical trouble, Susan always returned later to finish the assigned lesson.

Near the end of the school year, when project students wrote and presented their own skits in a chapel program, Susan played the role of a smart young lady seeking employment and presenting herself for an interview. She distinguished herself as a perfect example of good manners, good grooming, and good English. She was criticized by some as being too artificial. Actually there was no affectation either in her voice or her manner of speaking. It was just a determined effort to be clear and correct, and it created a sensation because her speech was so different from that of others in the environment. Susan, however, did not seem to mind. She continued to speak as clearly as she could when she went about her business on the campus. In an interview with the laboratory assistant during her sophomore year, Susan said she had to overdo it a little at the beginning, but she believed that the artificiality would wear off in time and that she could speak standard English more naturally and fluently.

In her first essay Susan used nonstandard patterns like "I... spend most of my time this summer...." "I really did thought about college...." "I had to list the things that I need...." In her final essay she did not make a single mistake with her verbs, although she wrote several fragmentary sentences. A single strange deviation from standard English appeared in the form of *ye self* (for *yourself*). She wrote: "I love my mother for teaching me the facts of life. The meaning of religion. And most of all to love one another as ye self. That is one verse I will never forget." It seems that she was quoting a Bible verse and perhaps *ye self* was the way her mother read it to her.

In her first interview at the beginning of the school year, the interviewer noted her tenseness in her effort to be correct. In spite of her effort, however, Susan made 3 mistakes in noun plural, 16 mistakes in the use of verbs, one in pronoun form, and used double subjects four times. She also used /d/ for initial /th/, and /n/ for final /ng/. Her first recordings in the language laboratory, which included a set of answers to a taped questionnaire and an unrestricted conversation with a classmate, showed a similar frequency in the use of dialectal patterns. In her final interview, she slipped once in each of the six categories: noun plural, verb tense, verb form, subject-verb agreement, pronoun form, and double negative, making a total of 6 as against the initial 24.

Susan's achievement can be summarized in her own words. "I am slowly improving," she said, "and I hope soon I can speak without fear."

Case 3: Alice (Experimental Group, 1963-64)

Tall, attractive, neat, and noticeably timid in speech, Alice began the school year determined to improve her skills in English. She was born in June, 1945, in the Bronx, New York, but was reared in a small South Carolina town. Her family consists of her parents, a grandmother, two younger brothers, and an older brother in college. Both parents work to support the family--one is a college graduate; they pay all of her educational expenses.

Alice was active in the dramatics and library clubs in her local high school. Softball is her hobby. In her initial interview, she related some of her experiences in the Woman's Softball League--a church-community sponsored project.

Alice was among several hundred students arrested in September, 1963, for participating in the civil rights demonstrations in Orangeburg.

On a questionnaire Alice confided that her classmates and her teachers had often criticized her for grammatical errors. She noted that her high school teachers and her parents were pleased with her progress in speech. She further stated that she felt self-conscious when she used good English in a group that did not, but denied that she ever "put on airs" although some of her friends seemed to think she was too "proud." She admitted that sometimes she had to make an effort to use good English in a situation that called for it, but sometimes "it came naturally."

Alice observed that most students use the local dialect in the dormitory and the dining hall. "They use this dialect so frequently that it is hard to refrain /from using it/," she concluded.

Willingly and with quiet enthusiasm, Alice participated in all phases of work in the English project. In the role-playing activity, she impersonated the leading character of the mother of a college boy. Her skit was later chosen to represent her class in a chapel program, and her speech patterns and her poise in the performance were equally remarkable.

Her improvement in English, which reflected her efforts as well as her ability, was evident in the CET results. From a rank of 74.5 among 116 entering freshmen in September, 1963, she advanced to a rank of 39 in May, 1964. In speaking, Alice showed less difficulty and hesitancy in her second interview than in her first. She was more confident and elaborated on her topics with a greater variety of sentence patterns.

In conclusion, Alice is an example showing what the Claflin project can do for a student who is sufficiently motivated. Of course, with an awareness of her shortcomings and a determination to improve herself, Alice can be benefited by any kind of program. We believe, however, that the approach we used was at least one of the many factors which helped her advance a major step forward in the attainment of her goal, writing and speaking standard English with confidence and ease.

Case 4: Tommy (Experimental Group, 1963-64)

A tall, slim, personable young man born and reared in South Carolina, Tommy was supremely confident of his ability to speak good English. His enunciation was very good, and it was clear that he enjoyed talking. However, his dialectal handicap was evidenced in the patterns he used, including it have, he have, mens, and others. He accumulated 29 such "errors" in his first interview.

Tommy responded enthusiastically in class, and was boyishly eager to assume the role of the instructor's assistant in distributing papers and in keeping the blackboards clean. In the language laboratory, on the other hand, he was indifferent. "I know my speaking English is fine; all my instructor need to do is correct my written English," he told the laboratory assistant. He admitted that his high school teacher had corrected his grammar "many times," but implied that he had no need for further corrections. Tommy believed his parents knew and used standard English. On his questionnaire he averred: "Yes, I have corrected my parents.... My parents were happy and then sometimes they just does it for the fun of it to see if I'm thinking.... They would be very pleased with me using correct grammar. The reason they are pleased, is because they knew when and what kind of verb and adverb to use."

Both of Tommy's parents work to support the family, and Tommy expects to go on to graduate school immediately after college with continued parental support. Besides Tommy and his parents, the family includes a younger brother in high school and an adopted sister. Tommy's interests are dancing, listening to records, and reading a little. His most important pre-college experience included a visit to a museum in May, 1963, when his high school senior class toured Washington, D. C.

Tommy sought a conference with his instructor when he received a "D" grade on a quiz and promised that he would do his best work in the future. His confidence, however, always exceeded his performance, and he did not ask for further help although his instructor assured him of her availability for conferences.

Though Tommy did not like individual pattern practice in an isolated booth, the group practice greatly stimulated him. He never believed that he needed any oral practice in usage patterns, pronunciation, or enunciation, but he believed he could help his classmates. He would play the role of leader or teacher, developing imaginary situations and calling on his classmates to respond to his questions in a specific usage pattern. He enjoyed this speaking game so immensely that he requested, at each session, permission to join the next group and remain a full class period rather than go on to other activities scheduled for him. His elevated opinion of himself was noted both by his instructor and the laboratory assistant.

The laboratory sessions during the second semester were centered on role playing as well as oral practice. In this new activity, students in the experimental class, in groups of four or five, wrote skits involving certain usage patterns and according to specific instructions. The groups acted out each skit at the end of each week. All the students were expected to become familiar with their parts without dependence on the written script, although they were not required to memorize their speeches.

Tommy did quite well for a while, but it was increasingly evident that he was not as superior as he thought, and he himself knew it. His grades remained on the C level or lower. Shortly before the mid-term examinations in middle March, his instructor wanted to have a conference with him to see if she could help. Tommy was erasing the blackboard as usual after the class was dismissed. When he saw the instructor approach, he dropped the eraser and ran out of the classroom. After that, he did his best to avoid both the instructor and the laboratory assistant.

Very little camaraderie existed between Tommy and his peers, who did not appreciate his superior air or his attempts to dominate them.

In early April, Tommy participated in a skit in the character of a corporation president who was conducting a meeting with new personnel. His role involved giving the history of the company and the growth of the business--in the past tense. Tommy attempted several times to start his speech, but he had forgotten the exact wording. He was encouraged to use his own words, but he could not do that, either. He tried and tried but could not utter a word. Finally, he left the "stage" and the skit went on without him. His confidence was totally shattered.

As the students were competing to have their respective skits selected for a chapel program at that time, it was possible that Tommy was overcome by anxiety in trying too hard to get himself and his skit on the program. He said later he had memorized the script but could not remember anything.

After that Tommy gave up trying to learn or to pretend. He was indifferent both in class and in the practice sessions. He kept to himself, avoiding both his teachers and his peers. He failed to come for conferences and meetings even when he said he would. In his final interview, he was apparently unconcerned, and less self-conscious. His enunciation was less meticulous. He still used has did, they looks, and theirselves, but he also corrected himself at times, and he never used the double subject, which he had used six times in the first interview. All in all, he made a total of 21 errors in the final interview as against his original 29.

Did pattern practice help Tommy? It certainly did in the group practice, when he was doing his share of pattern practice because he thought he was helping others practice standard English. Perhaps Tommy would have been better off if he could have had more small group practice instead of role playing; but again, it is doubtful how much longer his classmates would have put up with his "teaching."

It may be better, in the long run, that he sees his handicap as others see it and learns to accept it. If he can correct himself --his attitude and his errors--as he showed he could in the final interview, he may not be too badly off after all.

Case 5: Roseanne (Experimental Group, 1963-64)

Roseanne came from a small town near Charleston, to use her own words, "a small town...considered one of the best in the county." This is probably true judging from her better than average background in English fundamentals. She was at the top of her class during her freshman year, after she was assigned to an experimental section of the project.

During the first few class periods Roseanne distinguished herself by volunteering an answer to every question the teacher asked and also by her command of standard English. She spoke with evident self confidence and obviously enjoyed expressing herself. She also showed that she had a good knowledge of English grammar in terms of definitions and rules.

A little more time revealed her dialectal background. For one thing, she used the dialect consistently outside the classroom, even in the office talking to the instructor or the laboratory assistant. She also "slipped" badly in class as she settled down and relaxed. Although she was always quick in spotting her classmates' mistakes, she did not seem to be aware that she was making the same mistakes herself.

Roseanne's family consists of her parents, a brother, and a sister besides herself. Her father is a construction worker with a moderate income, but Roseanne does not foresee any difficulty getting through college. A good typist, Roseanne obtained a typist's job on the campus, but she quit because she did not "feel like working." She did not work in the summer either.

Roseanne traveled five times to New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia, just vacationing and for fun, but she had never visited a museum before she came to college.

With a quick mind and a good background, Roseanne did not need to work very hard to stay at the top. In fact she often had a tendency to get by. On the other hand, she strove very hard to get recognition. In class she kept raising her hand in repeated attempts to obtain the floor and, if her signal was ignored, would wave her hand impatiently to attract the instructor's attention. The instructor had to talk to her privately asking her to calm down and give other students a chance to talk. Roseanne dutifully complied, but she soon forgot and again insisted on getting all the attention she could.

During practice sessions, Roseanne cooperated but only in a perfunctory manner. She evidently needed more challenge.

She found her challenge in role-playing during the second semester, but she tried so hard to be the leader of her small group that a serious conflict was averted only after some regrouping. Then Roseanne, playing the role of a PTA president, made a lengthy, high sounding speech in perfect standard English. Her skit was not selected for the chapel program because of the unevenness of the different roles, and Roseanne, being a good typist, was asked to type copies of the scripts for those preparing for the chapel program. She was praised for her work and, for once, seemed perfectly content to make her contribution in this quiet manner instead of pushing herself into the limelight.

A little later, Dr. Francis Shoemaker, Professor of English at Teachers College, Columbia University, and a consultant to the Claflin project, visited the class. A Biblical passage had just been used for grammatical analysis, and the students had repeated the sentences in unison for pattern practice, when Dr. Shoemaker joined in to show the students how to read.

The passage used was:

> ...A man scatters seed on the land; he goes to bed at night and gets up in the morning, and the seed sprouts and grows--how, he does not know. The ground produces a crop by itself, first the blade, then the ear, then full-grown corn in the ear; but as soon as the crop is ripe, he sets to work with the sickle, because harvest-time has come.[29]
>
> --Mark 4:26-29

Dr. Shoemaker first asked the students the difference between the word land in the first sentence and the word ground in the second sentence, and suggested that the students use their voices to indicate the vastness of the land. Then he asked the students to read the first part of the second sentence, "The ground produces a crop by itself, first the blade, then the ear, then full-grown corn in the ear;" and let the voices "grow" as the corn grows. Shy and hesitant, the students responded; and Roseanne, always quick to distinguish herself, was soon singled out to demonstrate how the sentence should be read.

She tried many times, responding to suggestions and doing a little better each time until finally she was so absorbed in the effort that she seemed to have forgotten everything else, including the attention which she so obviously enjoyed at the beginning.

---

[29] The New English Bible: New Testament, p. 63. Copyright by The Delegates of the Oxford University Press and and the Syndics of The Cambridge University Press, 1961. Used by permission of the publishers.

After this Roseanne no longer fought for a chance to talk in class. She became more interested in the way she talked rather than just talking. Her work also became less perfunctory and more meticulous.

April changed to May, time for the second interview. Judging from the way Roseanne talked in the classroom, we had reason to expect a good showing from her. On the contrary, she ended up with more errors than she had made in her first interview.

And Roseanne knew it. When the subject was brought up in class that some students showed regression rather than progress on the interview, Roseanne was the first to explain. She described how she tried to be correct, and then, she discovered that she had said something wrong. After that, she said, she kept thinking about that one mistake and went on making more. She just couldn't concentrate on the interview any longer.

"I even used the word snows. I never said snows in my life," she said, exasperated. She was obviously trying to understand herself.

"You mean trying too hard could produce some negative results," the instructor suggested.

"Yes, definitely." Roseanne was happy to find an answer.

What will happen to Roseanne after her experience in the project? The human being is too complicated to be predictable. We believe that, instead of always offering answers for other people, Roseanne probably will find a few answers for herself. At least, she has found some in the project.

Case 6: Willie (Experimental Group, 1963-64)

Willie is a quiet lad of 18 who always told himself (and later confided to the language laboratory assistant), "I'll wait to see what the teacher wants before I say something."

Willie was born in a small town near Charleston, South Carolina. He lives with both parents and there are four other children in the family. His two older brothers, one a high school graduate and the other a college graduate, are working in New York. A sister, whom he adores, has been working in Willie's home town since graduation from college. A younger brother is in high school. Willie's sister has had an extraordinary influence upon his life. He talked constantly about her, and seemed to have developed a very friendly and respectful attitude toward women because of her, although he often exaggerated a little when referring to them, boasting of having "one in every port."

Willie's father completed the eighth grade and supports his family on an above-average income as a brick mason. Willie's mother is a high school English teacher. They are responsible for all of Willie's educational expenses.

The family goes to church together regularly in their home town.

Willie attended the local high school, where he played football (his first love) and basketball, drove the school bus, was a member of the library club, and a member of the student government. About the latter, "I had to drop it when I started messing around with so many girls," he said.

Referring to his first week at Claflin, he said, "I was so scared, I felt choked. I called home and told my parents to come for me." His parents came, but it was his sister who prevailed upon him to stay.

During the greater part of his first semester in college, Willie was shy, nervous, and very quiet. Perhaps too much family love had made him afraid of the outside world. When asked to talk about his adjustment period in the dormitory, he answered wryly, "It is kind of tough having 125 neighbors."

In the classroom, he seemed to resent any attempt to single him out from a group. He evaded personal conferences and refused help. His lack of response to any of the methods used in class and in small practice sessions, together with his poor performance in written work, gave the impression that he was beyond redemption.

Toward the end of the first semester, however, Willie seemed to begin to awaken. His daily grades improved, slowly but steadily. He began to react to encouragement, started asking questions which, to the surprise of the teacher, were very sensible. While many students asked the teacher to repeat what she had just said, Willie asked the teacher to explain what she had not explained. In the practice sessions, while still answering the assistant's questions with "no," "yes," "maybe," or "I don't know," Willie began making friends and speaking to his peers. The assistant noticed, too, that he was even more talkative outside the classroom.

Later in a conference with the assistant, Willie revealed a feeling of insecurity even with his peers. "They all seemed smarter than me," he said voluntarily. "I see no reason for me to answer or volunteer for discussions in class. They already know the answers, and they say the same thing I'm thinking." "Anyway," he continued, "I get choked up and can't never say what I want to say."

At the beginning of the second semester, when practice sessions were dominated by role-playing activities and Willie was confronted with the realization that he had to perform, he froze. He said he was too nervous to stand before people and speak. The assistant, Mrs. Julie Wright, gave Willie some practice in control-breathing, which seemed to give him better control and more confidence. Later, in a conference with the instructor, he related this experience with obvious satisfaction. "I was always choked when I tried to talk," he said. "Mrs. Wright told me to take a deep breath before I started to talk and it worked!"

As the second semester progressed Willie developed greater confidence in himself and more interest in his school work. His participation and performance in the classroom and in the practice sessions improved in both quantity and in quality. He no longer evaded his problems, but readily admitted his inadequacy because now he was sure he could overcome it. His honesty with himself and his readiness to accept suggestions spurred him along. Answering a questionnaire in April, 1964, he could say, almost triumphantly, "Yes, people criticized me about my grammar, but before they had a chance to correct me, I corrected myself."

High school friends thought Willie "was exaggerating a little" in his attempt to use better English. Some thought he was putting on airs, but "It doesn't bother me when they say 'He is showing off,'" he said.

Willie conceded that he had to make an effort to use good English in a situation that called for it. "It helped a lot" to know the secret of taking a deep breath. He decided to speak "on a different level," even if he would sound different in a group.

As for correcting others, he never corrected his parents or any elderly person. He noticed some people appreciated while others disapproved of corrections. Willie "never tried to insult them in any way," but he corrected a few of his comrades, and the majority were appreciative.

During the latter half of the second semester the class discussed, a little more systematically, the structure of an English sentence. The instructor would first explain a pattern such as a sentence with a linking verb followed by a subject complement, give a few examples, and then ask students to volunteer more examples. Willie was always among the first to come up with correct and relevant examples, showing his perfect understanding in spite of his meager background in English grammar. Early in May, students were practicing the use of adjective versus adverb following the main verb of the sentence, such as he felt good, but he sang well. Willie had already given his example when he was called to have his terminal interview with the laboratory assistant. He ventured voluntarily when he was going out of the door, "Do you think I can do well on my interview?" The entire class was so pleasantly surprised that it roared with laughter. When Willie came back from the interview, the class was practicing the adverbial clause. Willie quickly joined in with the example, "Before I went to the interview, I was afraid."

He was indeed afraid and nervous, as were all other students forced to face the tape recorder for about twenty minutes; but he could talk more without any prompting from the instructor, enunciate his words freely and more distinctly, was more confident of himself in May than in the previous September. Although one could sense the tremendous amount of effort and concentration put into the telling of the story which Willie developed from a picture, he was neither "choked" nor withdrawn. He sustained himself beautifully, emerging with more words and fewer mistakes than in the September interview.

The local grammar test and the essay test for all project students were scheduled for 7-9 p.m. on May 6. The testing, unfortunately, lasted longer than expected because the projector for the film on which the essay was based developed difficulty on the sound track. It was long past 9:30 when the students were finally dismissed. Because of the late dismissal, and because the laboratory assistant would be busy interviewing anyway, it was decided that the students should be excused from the practice session the following day. Shortly after 8:30 the next morning, when the instructor went into the classroom to dismiss the first practice session, she found only Willie and his pal still there, busily talking. Before the instructor could say that they were excused, Willie started to ask questions about the grammar test he had taken the night before. He said he was still confused. He remembered many items that he was unsure of and asked the instructor to explain the usage in each. From there he asked for suggestions as to how he could continue to work on and improve his English. Finally, he asked a "favor" of the instructor; he wanted to know how to say "How do you do" in Chinese. "I want to learn this so I can say it to Dr. Lin next year," he explained. (Dr. Paul Lin is one of the instructors of World Literature, required of all sophomores.)

This is Willie. Always evading the conferences in the first part of the year, he now obviously enjoys keeping a conference going on his own. Insisting on going home during his first week of college, he can now look forward to his sophomore year with eager anticipation.

Willie's is a typical case of a late bloomer who, in spite of much loss of time, could still be benefited by a language program geared to meet his needs. His attitude and language habits were molded by diverse influences. Although Willie's mother had been an English teacher for twenty years and "she knew every error" that her son made (a fact of which Willie was obviously proud), Willie had considerable difficulty with his dialect when he first came to college. Whether Willie suffered from the absence of a working mother who was busy augmenting the family income so that her children could enjoy better educational opportunities, or whether, by trying too hard to be correct by his mother's exacting standard, Willie had developed anxieties and inhibitions in connection with language usage, nobody can tell.

Although test scores showed that Willie had made considerable progress in the use of English, as did his final essay and interview, Willie had not completely overcome his dialect difficulty at the end of the nine-month period. But he was aware of his problem, and determined to face it. He had had a good beginning and was confident that he could go on.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS

A. Tasks Accomplished

The Claflin Project, which started in September, 1961, and concluded in June, 1964, accomplished the following tasks:

1. One hundred and forty-one freshmen at Claflin College used pattern practice techniques to master standard English as a second language in addition to their nonstandard dialect. These 141 freshmen included 51 in 1961-62, 62 in 1962-63, and 28 in 1963-64.

2. Thirty-two more students who were placed in the control group in 1963-64 did not have pattern practice, but they were helped to understand their dialect problems and the social implication of such problems, and they were given an enriched program in which they listened to good speech and practiced it in group discussions, oral presentations, and role playing.

3. Sixty laboratory lessons were prepared and recorded on tape to implement the pattern practice techniques. A local grammar test was devised to test the students' awareness of the difference between standard and dialectal usage. An integrated instructional and practice program incorporating pattern practice into the teaching of pronunciation and enunciation, spelling, reading, writing, and grammar was worked out for the experimental classes.

4. An attempt was made to develop an essay test and an interview to measure the student's ability to use standard English in speaking and writing. In the conducting of the essay test and the interview, a procedure using audio-visual aids to supply the subject of discussion proved superior to other procedures attempted. In the evaluation of the essay test and the interviews, however,

the staff was not satisfied with the count-error approach but was unable to develop a method which could measure with validity and reliability the students' ability and achievement in the use of standard English.

5. In planning, developing, and evaluating the methods and procedures used in the project, the staff had firsthand experience in the discipline of research, which is greatly different from routine teaching. Members of the project staff, with the help of consultants from Teachers College, Columbia University, developed better insight into, and a more realistic attitude toward, the usage problem and the teaching of standard English to students with a nonstandard dialect.

B. Limitations of the Project

Some limitations of the project became clear as it went into action.

Techniques, which involve using repetitious drills to establish the control over one unit of grammatical structure at a time, do not appeal greatly to most college students. To know that a child learns a language most effectively through imitation, repetition, and assimilation is one thing; to ask a college student to assume the mentality of a child and start from the beginning is another. Further, it appears to be presumptuous to claim that any method can, in nine months, give the student a full command of the standard dialect when it is psychologically and socially difficult for him to use anything but the nonstandard dialect in his daily life, even on a college campus.

In many situations, the college, a small Negro college in a small, segregated community, had to rely on its own limited facilities instead of community resources. The recording of taped lessons was not a professional job. The servicing of the language laboratory became a problem. The students had little opportunity to be stimulated by cultivated or standard speech actually used in everyday communication. On the contrary, they usually showed regression after the many interruptions in the nine-month period such as the Thanksgiving holidays, Christmas holidays, the between-semester break, and spring holidays. One student wrote of his Christmas vacation, "Since I was home I had to talk as they talked or be called a high-hatter or be ridiculed." He was surprised at his own change: "Even though I have been exposed to bad English all my life, I didn't think speaking good English for three months could have that much of an effect on me," but, "I can't use it when at home, unless I'm with someone who appreciates good English."

The college freshmen had another serious problem, the problem of adjustment. The changes from a high school curriculum to a college curriculum, and from home to campus residence were difficult enough for many students. Adjustment to an English class completely different from their high school English classes could be bewildering or upsetting. Some students admitted that they had difficulty finding out what the instructor really wanted. The sense of hopelessness in some or the sense of pride in others was often greatly exaggerated, with neither attitude conducive to the will or effort to change. It was usually at the end of the first or the beginning of the second semester before students began to develop enough awareness or enough understanding of the task involved to appreciate the new approach and to apply the effort required. At the end of each year, the staff had the feeling that the work had barely begun.

The staff members themselves felt their limitations keenly. The experiment led them into various unfamiliar fields: not just linguistics, but psychology, sociology, testing, audio-visual aids, and statistics. The staff was further handicapped by a turnover problem. Each year there were two or three staff members new on the job, preventing an accumulation of experience which is vitally important for such experiment. Although everyone did his best in the light of his judgment, the new members in the final year deeply regretted that they had not joined the project at its inception.

Lastly, the difficulty of interpreting a subjective test such as the essay test or the interview was never overcome, and the staff inevitably felt that somehow the statistical data could not adequately show all that the project had done for the students.

C. The Students' Achievements

1. With the help of pattern practice, many students succeeded in establishing greater control in the use of standard patterns. This control, however, was in delicate balance, and a different mood or a different situation could bring about a completely different style and elicit a different set of speech patterns. This contributed to the fluctuation of essay test results.

2. The students, including those in the control group, developed a keen awareness and alertness to the differences between acceptable and unacceptable usages which they had not previously had. It was probably the effect of this awareness in all the project students, as well as the inability of those participating in pattern practice to establish firm habits in so short a time, which accounted for the lack of significant difference between test data of the two groups.

3. The students acquired greater self-confidence and stronger determination for improvement in dealing with the dialect problem. This was shown in their better enunciation, greater ease in communication, and their readiness to correct themselves-all of which were evidenced on the interview tapes.

4. Evidently proud of their achievement, the students were sharing their understanding of language usage in their respective communities and were instrumental in bringing about an awareness of the dialect problem among their relatives and friends. Project students in 1963-64 said little about ostracism or parental disapproval on account of their use of standard English, a situation frequently discussed by project students in 1961-62.

5. An unexpected result of the Claflin project should be reported here, even though it is not directly related to the specific aim of the project, which was to enable nonstandard speakers to use standard forms of grammatical usage in their own speech and writing. Scores on the Cooperative English Tests revealed that the experimental group made greater gains in reading after a year of pattern practice than did the members of the control group, in spite of the fact that the program for the control group gave more attention to reading, as such, and to discussions of material read. This suggests that the use of pattern practice techniques can sharpen students' awareness of structural matters in such a way as to improve their comprehension of material that they read. After a year of working systematically and intensively with various patterns of English, the experimental students were apparently better equipped to read passages which required an alert attention to structural signals.

6. Although the total scores of the experimental students on the locally prepared grammar test were no higher than the total scores of the control group students on the same test, nevertheless the experimental group made greater improvement in one important respect: they were more successful in responding to items on the test that related to matters of usage which are indisputable distinctions between standard and nonstandard English. Most of the errors made on the local test by the experimental (pattern practice) students involved usages that are becoming increasingly acceptable in standard English. Examples of items missed were the following: "Everyone was supposed to bring their lunch," or "This color is different than that." Because such usages are often heard in the speech of educated persons, they had not been dealt with in the pattern practice exercises to any extent. Items testing students' responses to these usages had been included in the local test only in order to make the test comparable to nationally standardized tests. In terms of the conspicuous hallmarks of standard English (as contrasted with the nonstandard dialect) the students who had taken part in pattern practice demonstrated significant improvement, not only in recognizing "incorrect" forms but also in supplying the needed "correct" ones.

D. Findings Related to Adaptations of the Pattern Practice Techniques

In the judgment of the staff, the Claflin project's chief contribution to an eventual solution of the nationwide problem of the speaker of a nonstandard dialect will lie less in its statistical data than in certain insights gained from the experience, particularly with regard to adapting pattern practice techniques. In the course of the three-year experiment, the project staff observed the following:

1. Native speakers of English who wish to master the standard dialect do need pattern practice, and they do benefit from pattern practice. However, pattern practice for native speakers of English must take a form quite different from that customarily used in teaching English to speakers of other languages.

2. To be effective with native speakers, pattern practice should be used throughout the regular classroom program, not just as an appendage to be handled in the language laboratory. Guided by a skillful teacher, the students can be practicing one or more needed patterns while they are discussing vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and other matters normally taught in an English course. Pattern practice can also take place while the students are engaged in guided discussion of reading materials appropriate to their interests and level of maturity. Pattern practice in these guises (or disguises) can be made palatable and useful even to college students, because they feel they are learning something suitably adult and challenging.[30]

3. For students like these, there should be a minimum of drill on unrelated, uninformative sentences just for the sake of imitation. When such drills are used, their use should be preceded by briskly executed oral quizzes designed to make the individual student aware of his need to acquire mastery over a specific pattern or form. For example, before a class is sent to the laboratory to work on pattern

---

[30] See Chapter III, pp. 46-68, for a detailed discussion of adaptations of the pattern practice techniques for students of standard English as a second dialect.

practice exercises on the forms of the verb *be*, such a quiz might be conducted in class or in supervised small-group practice.

Teacher: Say *is* or *are*, immediately, without stopping to think. Listen! That man...

Student 1: is

Teacher: The man who lives next door...

Student 2: is

Teacher: The men who ride to work with my brother...

Student 3: are

Teacher: The boys I play football with....

Student 4: is

(Student 4 has demonstrated, to himself as well as to the teacher, that he needs pattern practice on *is* vs. *are*. He is then more ready to concentrate on this item in a pattern practice session.)

E. Implications for Further Study

More experiments are needed to ascertain the effectiveness of pattern practice in the teaching of standard English as a second language to linguistically different students on the elementary school or high school level. On the college level, since the need still exists, experiments with student volunteers may reveal the importance of volition in changing dialect patterns.

For evaluation, the effectiveness of a series of free conversations or small group discussions recorded on tape and spaced at six or eight week intervals should be explored. More research will also be needed on evaluating the students' speech performance.

Since the teacher plays a key role in any instructional program, the implication for teacher training is clear. Both inservice and preservice training must take into consideration the principle of language learning as well as the psychology of learning for culturally different youth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Harold B. (ed.), *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958.

Allen, W. Stannard, *Living English Structure*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1959.

Anderson, Wallace L. and Norman C. Stageberg, *Introductory Readings on Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Atwood, E. Bagby, "The Methods of American Dialectology." *Zeitschrift Fur Mundartforschung*, V. XXX, No. 1, October, 1963.

Bach, Emmon, *An Introduction to Transformational Grammars*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Baldwin, James, "A Talk to Teachers," *Saturday Reveiw*. December 21, 1963, pp. 42-4.

Barrows, Marjorie Wescott, *Good English Through Practice*. New York: Henry Holt, 1956.

Basic Issues in the Teaching of English: From a Series of Conferences Held throughout 1958. Presented by American Studies Association, College English Association, Modern Language Association, and National Council of Teachers of English.

Bloch, Bernard and George L. Trager, *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

Bloomfield, Leonard, *Language*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1933.

____ *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones and Lowell Schoer, *Research in Written Composition*. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Brown, Dona Worrall, Wallace C. Brown and Dudley Bailey, *Form in Modern English*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Bruner, Jerome S., *On Knowing*. Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.

Bruner, Jerome S., The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Conlin, David A., Grammar for Written English. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Dean, Leonard F. and Kenneth G. Wilson, Essays on Language and Usage. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Dixson, Robert J. and Ralph S. Boggs, Sound Teaching. New York: Regents Publishing Co., Inc., 1959.

Ebbitt, Wilma R. and James Sledd (eds.), Dictionaries and That Dictionary. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1963.

Evans, Bergen and Cornelia Evans, A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage. New York: Random House, 1957.

Francis, Nelson, The Structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1958.

Fries, Charles Carpenter, American English Grammar. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940.

_____ Cumulative Pattern Practices. University of Michigan, English Language Institute, 1954.

_____ The Structure of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1952.

_____ The Teaching of English. Ann Arbor: G. Wahr Publishing Co., 1949.

_____ and Agnes C. Fries, Foundations for English Teaching. The English Language Exploratory Committee. Tokyo: Kenkyusha Ltd., 1961.

Golden, Ruth I., Effectiveness of Instructional Tapes for Changing Regional Speech Patterns. Detroit Public Schools. Detroit, Michigan, 1962.

_____ Improving Patterns of Language Usage. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960.

Hall, Robert A., Jr., Leave Your Language Alone. Ithaca, New York: Linguistica, 1950.

Hook, J. N. and E. G. Mathews, Modern American Grammar and Usage. The Ronald Press Co., New York.

Hutchinson, Joseph C., *The Language Laboratory*. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1961, No. 23. 2d. revised. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1962.

Jespersen, Otto, *How to Teach a Foreign Language*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1947.

____ *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. 7 volumes. Copenhagen: Ejner Munksgaard Co., 1913-1949.

Jewett, Arno et al (ed.), *Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth In Large Cities*. Excerpts of Speeches given at a conference, 1962. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1962.

Johnson, Guy B., *Folk Culture on St. Helena Island, South Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1930.

Keating, Raymond F., *A Study of the Effectiveness of Language Laboratories*. New York: Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Kenyon, John S. and Thomas A. Knott, *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1953.

Kurath, Hans. and Raven I. McDavid, Jr., *Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Labov, William, "Phonological Indices to Social Stratification." (Mimeographed report).

____ "The Reflection of Social Processes in Linguistic Structures." Columbia University, Eastern Sociological Society, 1964. (Unpublished article).

Lado, Robert, *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Laird, Charlton and Robert M. Gorrell, *English as Language: Backgrounds, Development, Usage*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc. , 1961.

Lee, Donald W., *English Language Reader*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1963.

Lefevre, Carl A., *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Lloyd, Donald J., and Harry R. Warfel, *American English in Its Cultural Setting*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Long, Ralph, *The Sentence and Its Parts: A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Marckwardt, Albert Henry, *Introduction to the English Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

_____ and Fred Walcott, *Facts About Current English Usage*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938.

Musgrave, Marianne E., "Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Students with Substandard Dialects," *CLA Journal*, Volume VII, No. 1, September 1963, pp. 84-91.

National Council of the Teachers of English, *The English Language Arts*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952.

Nida, Eugene A., *A Synopsis of English Syntax*. Linguistic Series No. 4. Norman, Okla.: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1960.

O'Connor, Patricia, *Modern Foreign Languages in High School*. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1961.

Pei, Mario, *Language for Everybody*. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1958.

Perrin, Porter G., *Writer's Guide and Index to English*, 3rd ed. New York: Scott-Foresman, 1959.

Pike, Kenneth, *The Intonation of American English*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Pooley, Robert C., *Teaching English Grammar*. Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

_____ *Teaching English Usage*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946.

Praninakas, Jean, *Rapid Review of English Grammar*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Roberts, Paul, *English Sentences*. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1962.

_____ *Patterns of English*. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1956.

_____ *Understanding English*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

_____ *Understanding Grammar*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Robertson, Stuart (Rev. by Frederic G. Cassidy), *The Development of Modern English*, 2nd ed. New York: Prentice Hall, 1954.

Sapir, Edward, *Language*. 2d ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949.

Schweinitz, Elizabeth, and Karl Schweinitz, *Interviewing in Social Security*. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1961.

Sledd, James, Harold B. Allen, L. M. Myers and C. C. Fries, *Linguistics--Current Issues*. Illinois: reprinted from *College English*, 1961.

_____ *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959.

Smith, Henry Lee, Jr., *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Squire, James R., et al., *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961.

Stack, Edward M., *The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Stewart, William A. (ed.), *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English*. Language Information Series 2. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

Stone, George Winchester, Jr. (ed.), *Issues, Problems, & Approaches in the Teaching of English*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Suloway, Irwin J. and Michael Shrugrue, *Promising Practices in the Teaching of English*. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Thomas, Charles K., *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English*. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.

Thomas, Ednah Shepard, *Evaluating Student Themes*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1955.

Trager, George L. and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., *An Outline of English Structure*, 2d ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1956.

Turner, Lorenzo Dow, *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Whatmough, Joshua, *Language: A Modern Synthesis*. New York: New American Library, 1956.

Whitehall, Harold, *Structural Essentials of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1956.

Wilbur, Leslie, and Lowell Dabbs, *Improving College English Skills*. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1962.

Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, *Basic Considerations for A New English Program*. Special Bulletin No. 8, October, 1963.

APPENDIX A: SOCIAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in or check the appropriate items. (You need not write your name or class.)

1. Date of birth: month__________ year__________
2. Place of birth: city__________ state__________
3. Sex: F.________ M.________
4. Parents: (Check) ________a. both living and together
   ________b. both living, divorced
   ________c. both living, separated
   ________d. one deceased __father __mother
   ________e. both deceased
5. Members of the family living together:
   ________father ________mother
   ________step father ________step mother
   ________grandfather ________grandmother
   ________uncle ________aunt
   ________brother(s) ________sister(s)
   ________guardian other than the above.
   Please specify: __________
6. Size of the family: (Circle appropriate figure) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more
   (Please include those attending college.)

7a. Education of the older generation (Place one check at the appropriate place for each parent, step parent, grandparent, uncle, aunt, or guardian)
   ________grade 6 or under
   ________grade 7-8
   ________grade 9-12
   ________high school graduate
   ________some college education
   ________college graduate ____beyond college

7b. Education of your generation: (Place one check for each brother or sister. Do not include yourself.
   ________now in elementary school
   ________now in high school
   ________now in college
   ________now in graduate school
   ________now working, never finished elementary school
   ________now working, never finished high school
   ________working after high school graduation
   ________working after college graduation
   ________working after receiving an advanced degree

8. Family employment:
   (Fill in the ones who support the family, specifying the occupation of each.)
   father__________
   mother__________
   grandfather__________

grandmother______________
brother or sister_________
others (Please specify.)
____

9. Family income: ____________$3,000 or under
____________$3,001-5,000
____________$5,001-7,500
____________$7,501-10,000
____________above $10,000

10. Your tuition is paid by: ______parents, grandparents, or stepparents
______older brothers or sisters
______yourself out of your earnings or savings
______scholarship funds
______government loan
______other means. Please specify: ______________________

11. Do you work during the school year?
______No.
______Yes. Type of work: ___________Earnings per month:______

12. Did you work during the last summer:
______No.
______Yes. Where: ____________________
Type of work: __________ Earnings per month:_____

13. Do you anticipate any financial difficulty getting through college? _______No.
_______Yes.

14. Do you anticipate going to graduate school?
_______No.
_______Yes, but will get a job first.
_______Yes, I will go right after graduation if I can get a scholarship.
_______Yes, my family intend to send me to graduate school right after graduation.

15. How many times have you traveled or visited outside the State of South Carolina? (Circle appropriate number.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

Name the places you have visited. Circle the places where you stayed over one month.
North of S. C.______________________________
South of S. C.______________________________
West of S. C.______________________________

16. Why did you visit those places?
________visited relatives
________worked
________just vacationed or traveled for fun
________other reasons. Please specify: ________________

17. Name the places you have visited in South Carolina. Circle those where you stayed for over one month.____________________

____

18. Approximately how many books do you have in your family?

____

19. Name the newspapers that you or your family subscribe to:

____

20. Name the magazines that you or your family subscribe to:

____

21. Name the newspapers and magazines that you read regularly:

____

22. Name the newspapers and magazines that you read occasionally:

____

23. Have you ever had a major accident?
__________No.
__________Yes. What kind? ____________________

24. Have you ever stayed in a hospital?
__________No.
__________Yes. How long? __________ For what illness? ________

25. Have you ever had a catastrophe in your family?
__________No.
__________Yes. What kind? ___________________________

26. Have you ever visited a museum?
__________No.
__________Yes. When?________________ Where?____________________

27. Have you ever served in the Armed Forces:
__________No.
__________Yes. When?______________ Where?_____________________

28. Have you ever been arrested?
__________No.
__________Yes. When?___________ Where?________________________
Reason____

29. Do you and your family go to church?
__________No. __________Sometimes ______________Regularly

30. What do the members of your family do together after work?
______watch television
______listen to the radio
______listen to recorded music. ______classical ______popular
______sew
______garden
______sit around and chat
______play cards
______read newspapers and magazines
______read books ______fiction ______non-fiction
______visit neighbors, relatives or friends
______go to movies
______help in your church or community. Specify: ___________
______others. Specify: ____

APPENDIX B: SAMPLES OF LABORATORY LESSONS

Series L	Lesson 2	*To and Too*
Series I	Lesson 3	*There Is; There Are*
Series I	Lesson 12	*Listen Carefully and Answer*
Series I	Lesson 17	*We Didn't Have; We Had*
Series I	Lesson 22	*The Past Tense With The ed Ending*
Series I	Lesson 25	*The Present Perfect Tense With Regular Verbs*
Series I	Lesson 27	*More Practice on the Present Perfect Tense*
Series I	Lesson 28	*More Practice on the Present Perfect Tense*
Series I	Lesson 29	*Tell a Story in the Present Tense*
Series I	Lesson 30	*Tell a Story in the Past Tense*
Series I	Lesson 31	*Another Story in the Present Tense*
Series I	Lesson 32	*Another Story in the Past Tense*
Series I	Lesson 33	*The Past Tense of Some Irregular Verbs*
Series I	Lesson 39	*So...That*

SERIES L LESSON 2

HOMONYMS (TO AND TOO)

A. To and too are not exactly homonyms. They sound alike only when they are pronounced separately, but they never sound alike when they are used in a sentence: It is too good to be true. Listen to the following sentences. Notice how these two words are used in context; notice also how they are pronounced.

1. This is too good to be true.
2. You're too old to cry like this.
3. It's much too cold to swim.
4. It's too windy to go out.
5. This room is too small for all of us to be comfortable.
6. I'm too tired to work any more today.
7. His parents are too poor to send him to college.
8. I go to class at 8:30, and my roommate does, too.
9. I talked to the counselor, and Mary did, too.
10. He always attempted to do too much. Consequently, his work wasn't too satisfactory.

B. Have you noticed how too (t-o-o) as an adverb is always stressed in a sentence? On the other hand, to (t-o) is almost never stressed. Now take a sheet of your notebook paper, cover up the mimeographed sheet, and write down these sentences: ....

C. Have you finished? Now listen once more for proofreading. Then check your work against the mimeographed sheet to see whether you still make mistakes. When you have finished, that is the end of this lesson. Good-by.

SERIES I LESSON 3

THERE IS, THERE ARE

A. Repeat each question and answer after the instructor. Pronounce each word as clearly as you can, and record.

1. How are books classified in the library?
   There are different ways to classify books, according to different purposes. First, there are fiction and non-fiction books, but this dichotomy is not very helpful, because there are many different kinds of non-fiction books.
2. Are there some simple and useful ways of classification that I should know about?
   There are various types of reading materials located in various sections of the library. There are the newspapers and magazines in the periodical room. There are the dictionaries, the encyclopedias and other reference works in the reference room. There are novels and other books for light reading in the browsing room. Finally, there are numerous general books stored in the stack room.
3. Is there a system in arranging the books on the shelves?
   Yes. According to the Dewey Decimal System, there are ten categories of books. There is a definite call number assigned to each book.
4. Is there a way a student can locate a book quickly?
   Yes, there is the card catalog to help him find the call number of the book he wants. If he has difficulty, there is always some one at the desk to help him.

B. Now answer the following questions as best you can, using "There is..." or "There are..." to begin your answers.

1. Are there different ways to classify books?
2. Are there various types of reading materials in various sections of the library?
3. What books are there in the reference room?
4. Are there others?
5. How many categories of books are there in the Dewey Decimal System?

C. Now, rewind your tape to the original starting point, and review your work for today. If you find anything unsatisfactory, you may record again, and your first unsatisfactory recording will be automatically erased. When you are through with your review, that will be all for today. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 12

LISTEN CAREFULLY AND ANSWER

(A Review Lesson)

A. Listen carefully to the following questions. Answer each question as quickly as you can, and record. Then listen to the instructor's answer to see whether your answer is right or wrong.

1. My mother has two brothers and my father has two sisters. How many uncles and aunts do I have?

   ....

   I have two uncles and two aunts.

   How many brothers does my mother have?

   ....

   My mother has two brothers.

   How many sisters does my father have?

   ....

   My father has two sisters.

2. One of my uncles has two children and the other has three, but my aunts do not have any children. How many cousins do I have?

   ....

   I have five cousins altogether.

   How many children do my uncles have?

   ....

   One uncle has two children, and the other has three.

   How many children do my aunts have?

   ....

   My aunts do not have any children.

3. John's paternal grandfather and grandmother have three sons, and each son has three children. How many grandchildren do they have?

   ....

   They have nine grandchildren.

   How many grandchildren does John's grandfather have?

   ....

   John's grandfather has nine grandchildren.

How many grandchildren does John's grandmother have?

....

John's grandmother has nine grandchildren also.

How many children does John's father have?

....

John's father has three children.

How many cousins does John have?

....

John has at least six cousins, perhaps more.

How do you know that John probably has more cousins?

....

He probably has more cousins on his mother's side.

4. I have twenty dollars in the bank, but my brother has twice as much as I have. How much money does my brother have?

   ....

   He has forty dollars.

   My little sister has only one fifth as much as my brother has. How much money does she have?

   ....

   She has only eight dollars.

   Between my brother and me, how much money do we have?

   ....

   We have sixty dollars.

   How much money do all three of us have?

   ....

   We have sixty-eight dollars altogether.

B. Now rewind your tape to the original starting point, and review your work for today. When you are through, that will be all. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 17

WE DIDN'T HAVE; WE HAD

A. The basic pattern to be practiced in this lesson is the use of had, which is the past tense of the verb to have. Listen carefully to the following sentences. Repeat after the instructor and record.

1. Did you have algebra and geometry in high school?
   No, we didn't have both, but we had algebra in the ninth grade.

2. Did you have foreign languages in high school?
   We had two foreign languages to choose from, French and Spanish. I didn't have Spanish, but I had two years of French.

3. Did you have any extracurricular activities in high school?
   Yes, we had chorus and band.
   We had basketball and softball.
   We also had student government and class organizations.

4. Did you have vocational training in your high school?
   Yes, we had various courses in secretarial work, home economics and mechanics.

5. Did you have much competition in your high school class?
   Yes, we had considerable competition in our senior class, particularly among those who planned to go to college.

6. Did you have any childhood diseases?
   Yes, I had measles and chicken pox.

7. Did you have diphtheria or whooping cough?
   No, I didn't have either diphtheria or whooping cough.
   I had inoculations to protect me from these diseases.

8. Did you have small pox vaccination and polio shots?
   No, I didn't have any polio shots. Nobody had polio shots at that time, but everyone had small pox vaccinations.

9. Did you have a pediatrician to take care of you when you were a child?
   Yes, we had a pediatrician to give us regular check-ups.

10. Did you have regular dental check-ups, too?
    No, I didn't see the dentist unless I had trouble with my teeth. In fact, I had very little trouble with my baby teeth or my permanent teeth.

B. Now answer the following questions and record your answers.

1. Did you have algebra or geometry in high school?
2. Did you have foreign languages in high school?
3. Did you have any extracurricular activities in high school?
4. Did you have vocational training in your high school?
5. Did you have much competition in your high school class?
6. Did you have any childhood diseases?
7. Did you have diphtheria or whooping cough?
8. Did you have smallpox vaccination and polio shots?
9. Did you have a pediatrician to take care of you when you were a child?
10. Did you have regular dental check-ups, too?

C. Now rewind your tape to the original starting point, and review your work for today. When you are through, that will be all. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 22

THE PAST TENSE WITH THE ED ENDING

A. The basic patterns to be practiced in this lesson concern the past forms of some other regular verbs. These verbs do not end with a t or d sound, and the -ed ending added to the verb does not form another syllable. Consequently, the -ed ending that signifies the past tense is easily neglected and omitted in both speaking and writing.

Repeat the following sentences. Pay particular attention to the -ed endings of the verbs. Pronounce them distinctly.

What did you do last night?
I helped my mother do the dishes.
I washed the dishes after supper.
I watched television.
I listened to the radio.
I ironed my clothes.
I practiced my piano lesson.
I finished my assignment.
I accompanied my friend to the movies.

What did John do yesterday afternoon?
He repaired his radio.
He watched television.
He helped his father at the shop.
He finished painting Mrs. Brown's house.
He mopped the front porch.
He trimmed the lady's trees.
He mowed the lawn with a lawn mower.
He looked after the children when Mother shopped downtown.

B. Answer the following questions:

1. What did you do last night?
2. What did John do yesterday afternoon?
3. Who mopped the front porch last time?
4. Who trimmed the lady's fruit trees?
5. Who looked after the children when Mother shopped?
6. Who repaired your radio for you?
7. Who ironed the children's clothes?
8. Who washed the dishes this morning?
9. Who closed all the windows?
10. Who finished all the cookies in the jar?

C. Review your recording. Check whether you pronounced all the ed endings distinctly enough. When you are through, that will be all. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 25

THE PRESENT PERFECT TENSE WITH REGULAR VERBS

The pattern to be practiced in this lesson is the present perfect tense using the regular verbs. The perfect tense is formed by the use of the verb to have and the past participle form of the main verb.

A. Listen carefully to these questions and answers. Repeat after the instructor and record. Pronounce the ed ending as clearly as you can.

1. Have you finished your term paper about modern technological changes?
   Yes, I have already finished my term paper about modern technological changes. I finished it last Wednesday.

2. Have technological changes influenced modern living radically?
   Yes, technological changes have completely changed our ways of living.

3. In what way have these changes influenced the housewives?
   The electrical appliances in the home have reduced the work of the housewives tremendously.

4. In what way have these changes influenced the workers?
   Factory and office machines have shortened the hours of the workers.

5. In what way have these changes influenced children?
   The development of medical science has wiped out many childhood diseases and has decreased the mortality rate of children.

6. In what way have these changes affected education?
   Everybody's leisure time has increased, and more adults have gone back to school.

7. In what way have these changes influenced the aged people?
   The development of medical science has increased the life span of man. The number of aged people has been increased.

8. In what way have these changes influenced communication?
   The radio and television have enabled us to hear and see in our homes how things are happening around the world.

9. In what way have these changes influenced transportation? The airplanes and jets have shortened the distance between countries and peoples. Our national leaders, diplomats, businessmen and tourists have visited foreign countries in a matter of days or hours.

10. In what way have these changes influenced modern warfare? The atomic bombs, the hydrogen bombs and the rockets have completely revolutionized the techniques of modern warfare. People believe that many techniques used in World War II have been made obsolete.

B. If you think you can answer the questions without too much difficulty, go on to Part B. If not, rewind the tape to the beginning of this lesson to listen and repeat once more.

Answer the following questions and record:

(Use the same questions as used in A.)

C. Now rewind your tape to the original starting point, and review your work for today. When you are through, that will be all. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 27

MORE PRACTICE ON THE PRESENT PERFECT TENSE

This lesson gives you more practice in the use of the present perfect tense, with both regular and irregular verbs.

A. Listen carefully to the instructor. Repeat each sentence and record. Pronounce the ed ending clearly when the verb is regular. Notice the past participle form when the verb is irregular.

1. Scientists believe that living things have existed on earth for more than two billion years.
2. However, men have lived on this earth for about twenty thousand years only.
3. Nobody has found out exactly when men first appeared on earth.
4. Nobody has even seen a true picture of the prehistoric men.
5. Anthropologists have found pieces of their bones buried deep down beneath the earth.
6. Anthropologists have put these bones together.
7. They have been able to show us what the skull of prehistoric man is like.
8. All through the years anthropologists have dug deeper and deeper into the earth to find relics of the past.
9. They have dug up not only bones, but also other relics such as utensils, weapons, coins, and many other things.
10. Scientists have also discovered fossils of plants and animals that have long since disappeared from the earth.

B. If you think you can answer the questions without too much difficulty, go on to Part B. If not, rewind the tape to the beginning of this lesson to listen and repeat once more.

Answer the following questions and record:

(Use the same questions as used in A.)

C. Now rewind your tape to the original starting point, and review your work for today. When you are through, that will be all. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 28

MORE PRACTICE ON THE PRESENT PERFECT TENSE
(Continued)

This lesson gives you more practice in the use of the present perfect tense, with both regular and irregular verbs.

A. Listen carefully to the instructor. Repeat each sentence and record. Pronounce the ed ending clearly when the verb is regular. Notice the past participle form when the verb is irregular.

1. The study of the past has occupied many a lifetime of not only anthropologists and scientists, but also historians and linguists.
2. Historians have found scripts written in ancient languages.
3. These ancient records have recorded life in ancient Egypt and Babylonia.
4. Historians and linguists have deciphered and studied these ancient scripts. They have come to know things about ancient Egypt and Babylonia.
5. The linguists have found that ancient Greek, ancient Latin and an ancient Indian language called Sanskrit are very similar.
6. The linguists have thus proved that the Greeks, the Romans and the Indians are descended from common ancestors.
7. Through the efforts of these people, archeology, or the study of the past, has developed into an important field of knowledge.
8. Their curiosity and their zest for knowledge have driven them to dig deeper and to work harder.
9. They have taught us many interesting things about the past.
10. They have broadened the horizon of knowledge for all of us.

B. If you think you can answer the questions without too much difficulty, go on to Part B. If not, rewind the tape to the beginning of this lesson to listen and repeat once more.

Answer the following questions and record:

(Use the same questions as used in A.)

C. Now rewind your tape to the original starting point, and review your work for today. When you are through, that will be all. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 29

TELL A STORY IN THE PRESENT TENSE

A. This lesson gives you some review on the -s ending of the verb. Listen carefully to the following story. Pay particular attention to the verb form in each sentence. Repeat after the instructor and record.

Johnny is a little boy who love stories. Every evening at bed time he insists that his mother tell him some stories. Sometimes she tells the same story over and over again, but Johnny never gets tired of listening. Sometimes she sings him little nursery rhymes. Johnny thinks that they are so beautiful that even after he falls asleep he still hears her singing sweetly to him, or at least he thinks that he hears her.

Later on Johnny's mother buys him a book and they read the stories together. Johnny knows all the stories already, but they mean more to him when he reads the words and sees the pictures of the three bears, the seven dwarfs, etc. He finds out the meaning of the printed words and reads to himself when his mother is busy. That is the way Johnny's mother teaches him to read. That is the way Johnny begins to read.

B. Now do you think you can tell the same story in your own words, using the present tense? Try to do it and record. If you find that you have difficulty doing it, listen to the instructor's story again, and repeat each sentence after her until you can tell the story with ease. Then record your recitation until you are satisfied with it. Remember, you are to tell the same story in your own words using the present tense. When you have finished, that will be all for today.

SERIES I LESSON 30

TELL A STORY IN THE PAST TENSE

A. This story is similar to the previous one you had, but it is told in the past tense instead of in the present tense. Listen carefully to the instructor. Pay particular attention to the irregular past form of the verb. Repeat each sentence and record.

Who taught you to read when you were a child?

My mother taught me. When I was little my mother usually told me interesting stories at bed time. Sometimes she told the same story over and over again, but I never got tired of listening. Sometimes she sang me little nursery rhymes. They were so beautiful that even after I fell asleep I still heard her singing sweetly to me, or at least I thought I heard her.

Later on she bought me a book, and we read the stories together. I knew all the stories already, but they meant more to me when I read the words and saw the pictures of the three bears, the seven dwarfs, etc. I found out the meaning of the printed words and read to myself when my mother was busy. That was the way I began to read.

B. Now do you think you can tell the same story in your own words, using the past tense? Try to do it and record. If you find that you have difficulty doing it, listen to the instructor's story again, and repeat each sentence after her until you can tell the story with ease. Then record your recitation until you are satisfied with it. Remember, you are to tell the same story in your own words using the past tense. When you have finished, that will be all for today.

SERIES I LESSON 31

ANOTHER STORY IN THE PRESENT TENSE

A. This lesson gives you some review on the -s ending of the verb. Listen carefully to the following story. Pay particular attention to the verb form of each sentence. Repeat after the instructor and record.

Jane always goes to bed late and wakes up late in the morning. She tells herself that she must get up early and get to class on time, and she sets the alarm clock at six. The next morning, however, when the alarm clock rings, she doesn't even hear it. Thus she oversleeps and goes to class late. The instructor, of course, always wants an explanation and Jane always finds one, but she also finds that it is a nuisance to have to invent an explanation all the time.

Again she tells herself that she must do something about the situation. She never thinks of going to bed earlier, though. This time she buys an electric alarm clock. She thinks that an electric alarm clock will ring and ring until she wakes up.

The next morning, when the alarm clock rings and she finally wakes up, she feels so sleepy that she lies in bed for a long time before she makes up her mind to get up. Before she knows it, the first bell rings, she springs out of bed, puts on her clothes in a hurry, and runs to class. She barely makes it, but she is so sleepy that she doesn't hear a word of what the teacher says. "I must do something about the situation," she tells herself again, but she doesn't know what she can do, because she falls asleep again.

B. Now do you think you can tell the same story in your own words, using the present tense? Try to do it and record. If you find that you have difficulty doing it, listen to the instructor's story again, and repeat each sentence after her until you can tell the story with ease. Then record your recitation until you are satisfied with it. Remember, you are to tell the same story in your own words using the present tense. When you have finished, that will be all for today.

SERIES I LESSON 32

ANOTHER STORY IN THE PAST TENSE

A. This story is similar to the previous one you had, but it is told in the past tense instead of the present tense. Listen carefully to the instructor. Pay particular attention to the irregular past form of the verb. Repeat each sentence and record.

Jane always went to bed late and woke up late in the morning. She told herself that she must get up early and get to class on time, and she set the alarm clock at six. The next morning, however, when the alarm clock rang, she didn't even hear it. Thus she overslept and went to class late. The instructor, of course, always wanted an explanation and Jane always found one, but she also found that it was a nuisance to have to invent an explanation all the time.

Again she told herself that she must do something about the situation. She never thought of going to bed earlier, though. This time she bought an electric alarm clock. She thought an electric alarm clock would ring and ring until she woke up.

The next morning, when the alarm clock rang and she finally woke up, she felt so sleepy that she lay in bed for a long time before she made up her mind to get up. Before she knew it, the first bell rang, she sprang out of bed, put on her clothes in a hurry, and ran to class. She barely made it, but she was so sleepy that she didn't hear a word of what the teacher said. "I must do something about the situation," she told herself again, but she didn't know what she could do, because she fell asleep again.

B. Now do you think you can tell the same story in your own words using the past tense? Try to do it and record. If you find that you have difficulty doing it, listen to the instructor's story again, and repeat each sentence after her until you can tell the story with ease. Then record your recitation until you are satisfied with it. Remember, you are to tell the same story in your own words using the past tense. When you have finished, that will be all for today.

SERIES I LESSON 33

THE PAST TENSE OF SOME IRREGULAR VERBS

A. This lesson will give you some practice on the past form of some irregular verbs. Listen to the following sentences. Pay attention to the verb forms. Repeat after the instructor and record.

Did Chaucer write *The Odyssey* and *The Iliad*?
No, he didn't. Homer wrote *The Odyssey* and *The Iliad*.
Did Homer also write *The Aeneid*?
No, Homer didn't write *The Aeneid*: Virgil wrote *The Aeneid*.
What did Chaucer write?
Chaucer wrote *The Canterbury Tales*.
Did Chaucer also write *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*?
No, Chaucer didn't. Shakespeare wrote *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*.
Did you read any of these great works of world literature in high school?
Yes, I read some, but I didn't read all six of them.
What did you read?
I read *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* in high school, and I read *The Odyssey* last summer.
Did your high school teacher tell you to read these books?
She told us to choose one Shakespearean play to read. I chose *Macbeth*.
Why did you choose *Macbeth*?
I saw the movie of *Macbeth* on television. It was so interesting that I decided to read it.
Did you read the original play,written by Shakespeare, or did you read just the story or the synopsis?
First I read the original play, but it was too difficult for me to read in the twelfth grade so I read the story in *Tales from Shakespeare*, written by Charles and Mary Lamb.
What did your teacher tell you to do after reading it?
She told us to submit a written report or to give an oral presentation in class.
Which did you choose?
I gave my report orally.

B. Now listen to the following questions and give your own answers.

1. What did Chaucer write?
2. What did Shakespeare write?
3. What did Homer write?
4. What did Virgil write?
5. Did you read anything written by Shakespeare in high school?
6. Did you read anything written by Homer in high school?

7. What else did you read?
8. Did you read the original work, or did you just read the story or the synopsis?
9. Did you write a written report for any of the books you read?
10. Did you read other books not required by your high school English teacher?

C. Now rewind your tape and review the lesson for today. Listen carefully for possible mistakes. Learn to evaluate your speech and find ways to improve it. When you are through with your review, that will be all for today. Thank you.

SERIES I LESSON 39

SO...THAT

A. This lesson helps you learn to use the pattern "so...that" which is very useful in expressing the idea "to what extent" or "in what degree." In this lesson you can also learn a few very useful words.

Listen to the following sentences. Repeat each sentence and record.

1. His story was so ludicrous (ridiculous) that everybody burst into laughter.
2. Her excuse was so incredible (unbelievable) that nobody believed her.
3. The boss was so fastidious (hard to please) that the new secretary was very much discouraged.
4. The ambitious young man was so unscrupulous (lacking in moral principles) that he would do anything to get what he wanted.
5. Our new acquaintance is so loquacious (talkative) that no one can talk much when he is around.
6. Psychology seemed to him to be so abstruse (difficult and profound) that he gave up before he even tried.
7. The scientist was so tenacious (firm) in his belief that he finally proved his theory beyond a doubt.

B. Now listen to these sentences again. Instead of repeating after the instructor, you should substitute one synonym for another as you have just learned. For example, the instructor will say, "His story was so ridiculous that everybody burst into laughter." Then you will say, "His story was so ludicrous that everybody burst into laughter."

Listen as the instructor repeats the sentence to see if you have used the correct word. If not, listen to the sentence again and repeat it with the correct answer. Record your responses.

C. Now review your lesson for today. Make sure that all of your responses are correct. When you have finished, that will be all for today. Thank you.

APPENDIX C: SAMPLES OF ROLE PLAYING SKITS WRITTEN BY STUDENTS

1. GETTING MARRIED

(Experimental Group, 1962-63)

TRUMAN: Hi, Carnell and Mabel.

MABEL: Hello, Mr. and Mrs. Steveson. May we have a talk with you?

TRUMAN: Yes, about what?

CARNELL: We plan to get married.

DOROTHY: What kind of wedding will it be, large or small?

MABEL: Mrs. Steveson, we are serious.

TRUMAN: Oh yes, you are.

CARNELL: We come to see you because we feel we can trust you.

MABEL: We feel that you have more experience and that you can give us some advice.

TRUMAN: We can. You realize how serious this is?

MABEL: Yes, we do.

TRUMAN: How long have you known each other?

CARNELL: Oh, about six months.

DOROTHY: About six months? Aren't you rushing into things?

TRUMAN: You met her when school began?

CARNELL: Yes, we love each other very much.

TRUMAN: What do you know about each other?

CARNELL: I told her that I came from a broken family.

TRUMAN: I didn't know you came from a broken family.

CARNELL: My family broke up when I was a small boy.

MABEL: Although he is the product of a broken home, I love him. He has to make his own life and should not be judged by his parents.

CARNELL: A broken home is no life for anybody.

TRUMAN: So you think you are ready to provide a good home for Mabel and your future children?

CARNELL: My life has been wonderful since I met Mabel.

TRUMAN: What about you?

MABEL: He knows that I am not from a prosperous family.

CARNELL: Money is not everything in life.

TRUMAN: Are your parents together?

MABEL: Yes, they are together.

TRUMAN: What kind of work does your father do?

MABEL: My father is a farmer.

TRUMAN: I like a farmer's life.

MABEL: I hate it.

TRUMAN: What will your parents say about your getting married?

MABEL: My parents like Carnell. They won't mind.

CARNELL: I am not going to steal her from her family.

TRUMAN: I always say a woman not worth asking for is not worth having. You did well by asking her parents first.

CARNELL: I love her and she loves me.

TRUMAN: But are you sure you are not trying to run away from home?

DOROTHY: Carnell, perhaps you are trying to run away from your broken home; and Mabel, perhaps you are trying to run away from the farm that you hate.

MABEL: No, we aren't.

TRUMAN: Here comes a friend of mine, Geoffrey. He will not tell anyone about this.

MABEL: O.K., if you say so.

GEOFFREY: What are you doing?

TRUMAN: Have a seat. Carnell and Mabel are planning on getting married.

GEOFFREY: Is this true?

DOROTHY: If it isn't, they sure are great pretenders.

CARNELL: Yes, we were discussing it when you came in.

TRUMAN: What are you looking for at graduate school, Geoffrey?

GEOFFREY: I am looking for an education.

CARNELL: Do you love anyone?

GEOFFREY: Yes, everybody loves somebody.

CARNELL: Do you love her enough to marry her?

GEOFFREY: Yes, but we both realize that we have to finish graduate school first.

MABEL: We realize that we need to finish college, too, but we love each other and want to get married.

GEOFFREY: Look; who's against love. Nobody's against love, not even Truman.

TRUMAN: I am trying to find out why you are rushing into it. Then I might be able to help you.

CARNELL: We know that you are trying to help us.

TRUMAN: Do you have any close friends that are married?

MABEL: Yes, and they are very happy.

GEOFFREY: And you think that you will also be happy?

MABEL: Yes, how many times do we have to say we love each other before you believe us?

GEOFFREY: I believe you. Do you think that earlier marriages are really happier?

MABEL: Yes, they have ups and downs, but they make out.

GEOFFREY: I don't think that is an over all general answer.

TRUMAN: Do you know what you are going into when you get married?

DOROTHY: Marriage is more than just a wedding. Do you know that?

MABEL: Yes, we do.

GEOFFREY: You realize that you need to go to college. How will you support yourselves?

CARNELL: We can let our parents pay our way.

DOROTHY: Would you be happy?

CARNELL: No, but I can work and support her.

GEOFFREY: Ah, man, you will have to make up your mind.

MABEL: We'll be happy.

TRUMAN: What do you mean, you will be happy?

CARNELL: I love her and she loves me. We can never be lonely.

TRUMAN: Don't fool yourselves. Married teen-agers are among the loneliest people in the world.

MABEL: What do you mean? The loneliest people in the world?

TRUMAN: They cannot associate with teen-agers nor with adults. They are alone.

GEOFFREY: You know, many teen-agers separate. Do you know why?

MABEL: They didn't love each other in the first place.

CARNELL: Maybe it wasn't real love.

MABEL: I am glad that we have real love.

GEOFFREY: How do you know you don't have that thick and thin love?

CARNELL: What do you mean, thick and thin love?

GEOFFREY: When you first get married your love is thick, and later it will thin out on you.

TRUMAN: Early marriages put heavy strains on young people, and the cost of living is going up.

GEOFFREY: Yes, you are right, Truman. Love is good, but love is nothing by itself.

DOROTHY: I think everyone realizes that.

MABEL: I am confused.

CARNELL: I am also.

GEOFFREY: That's good.

TRUMAN: What kind of grades did you make the first semester?

MABEL: I made average grades.

CARNELL: I had a 1-point average.

TRUMAN: I think I may have found the reasons for your wanting to get married. You see many teen-agers get married because of irrelevant reasons.

GEOFFREY: What do you mean by irrelevant reasons?

TRUMAN: For example, happily married friends, unpleasant home conditions, bad grades while going to college, all of these could have affected you.

MABEL: You mean we want to get married just because of these things?

TRUMAN: Yes, the answer I am giving you is based on facts. You should try to understand yourselves and each other more.

DOROTHY: You should think a long time before you get married, and it should be deep thinking when it involves education.

MABEL: I can't see how these little things have anything to do with our wish to get married.

GEOFFREY: They are not little things.

TRUMAN: For example, you were having difficulties about your grades. I mean they are not the best grades.

MABEL: Yes, we both have a little difficulty with grades.

TRUMAN: Do you think that you can do better?

CARNELL: Yes, I can do better if I study harder.

GEOFFREY: Yes, I believe I can do better myself.

MABEL: But, we didn't, so after we failed, we tried to get out of it by getting married. Is this what happened to us?

TRUMAN: What do you think?

MABEL: I don't know. I kept asking myself "What will Mary say when she finds out I am going to get married?" You know Mary, my older sister. She has always had better grades than I, and I always find I am not as good as she. Perhaps by getting married first, I am just trying to get even.

TRUMAN: Perhaps, Mabel. As I said, many things could have affected you. Take Carnell and his broken family. A child from a broken family is hungry for love and sometimes mistakes sympathy for love.

CARNELL: Mr. Steveson, I think I am also abeginning to understand. myself better.

GEOFFREY: I think that you should stop thinking about getting married and start studying harder.

CARNELL: Maybe you are right.

MABEL: Carnell, maybe for once we should give it a little more thought.

CARNELL: Yes, maybe we should. Thanks, Mr. Steveson.

TRUMAN: What are you thinking about, Geoffrey?

GEOFFREY: Gee, getting married is really more complicated than I thought. Truman, should I get married or not?

TRUMAN: Only you can answer that question.

GEOFFREY: Do you have any advice for me?

TRUMAN: I don't, but the Bible has.

GEOFFREY: What does it say?

TRUMAN: It is about Love, Power, and a Sound Mind. They all need each other.

GEOFFREY: Love, Power, and a Sound Mind.

MABEL: Love, Power, and a Sound Mind. That's good! Thanks, Mr. Steveson.

DOROTHY: Oh, this is getting too serious. Come, let's go look at my roses.

2. THE PROBLEM OF ADJUSTMENT
(Experimental Group, 1963-64)

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Mrs. Patterson, I understand that you are here to withdraw your son from school.

MOTHER: Yes, that is correct.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: What are your reasons for wanting Eddie to withdraw from school?

MOTHER: I have received his nine weeks'grades and they aren't up to par. I know that my son, Eddie, is capable of making better grades. I feel that it would be a waste of money, time, and effort to let him continue when he fails. I have two more children whose education I have to consider. By letting Eddie remain here, I may deprive my other children of funds when they are ready for college. It is better for me to have him withdraw now rather than continue to waste money.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Mrs. Patterson, it takes time to get adjusted to college life. It doesn't mean that your son isn't capable of making better grades.

MOTHER: Mrs. Fredrick, are social activities compulsory?

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: No, they aren't. The students aren't compelled to go to any activities outside of Vespers and chapel programs.

MOTHER: But there must be something that is distracting my son's attention from his studies.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Maybe Eddie can give some reasons why his grades aren't up to par. (P. D. calls to secretary) Mrs. Bates, will you please have Eddie Patterson report to my office immediately?

SECRETARY: Yes, Mrs. Fredrick, one moment please.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Mrs. Patterson, I just know that your son has some explanations for his grades.

EDDIE: (Eddie enters) Hello, Mrs. Fredrick. Do you want to see me?

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Yes, Eddie.

EDDIE: Hello, mother, what are you doing here?

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Have a seat, Eddie.

EDDIE: (Sitting down) Thank you, m'am.

MOTHER: I have received your nine weeks' grades, and they are not up to par. Therefore, I am here to have you withdrawn from this school immediately.

EDDIE: But mother! you don't understand. If I withdraw now, I won't receive any credits at all. Think of all the money you'll be losing.

MOTHER: Think of all the money I'll be losing if you stay here and flunk.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Eddie, did you study at all or is it that you just did enough to get by.

EDDIE: I'll have to admit I didn't study very much. I devoted most of my time to social activities and going to the canteen instead of doing my homework; I played cards with the fellows and cracked jokes. By the time we were finished, I was too tired and sleepy to do any studying at all.

MOTHER: Young man, I know I am going to take you home now, if that's all you have to do with time.

EDDIE: Mother, please don't make me leave now. I"ve made so many friends and I like it here.

MOTHER: Don't argue, Eddie, I've made up my mind. I am going to take you home and that's that.

EDDIE: Mother, please let me stay. I promise to do better.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Mrs. Patterson, I think Eddie realizes that he has made a very big mistake. Now that he knows the cause of his low grades, I'm sure he'll do much better. Won't you, Eddie?

EDDIE: Yes, Mrs. Fredrick.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: Won't you reconsider, Mrs. Patterson?

MOTHER: (hesitating) Well, all right. He can stay.

EDDIE: Thank you, mother, I'll make you proud of me.

3. FATHER'S CONSENT
(Control Group, 1963-64)

ACT I

SHERYL: What a lovely evening this is.

HOWARD: It's even lovelier being here with you. (Pause) Sheryl.

SHERYL: Yes.

HOWARD: Do you love me?

SHERYL: Of course I do. Now, why did you ask me such a thing?

HOWARD: Well, we have been going together for quite some time. Do you feel that we are ready to face the responsibilities of marriage?

SHERYL: So that's what you have been wanting to say. So you finally got around to it.

HOWARD: Yes, now what do you think about it?

SHERYL: Well, Howard, marriage is a very serious matter, you can make it what you want to, but I tell you I am ready for it if you are.

HOWARD: Well, I think that's about the best thing we can do. So will you accept my proposal? Will you marry me?

SHERYL: Howard! Why did you ask me a question like that? Were you afraid I wouldn't accept your proposal? Howard, you know I will, but first you will have to discuss it with father.

HOWARD: That I know. You think he will be somewhat surprised or shocked? Just what do you think his reactions will be?

SHERYL: I don't know. We'll just have to cross that when we get to it.

HOWARD: Shall I come to your house tonight?

SHERYL: Yes, dear.

HOWARD: O.K. Goodbye, sweetie.

SHERYL: Goodbye, darling.

(Curtain closes)

Howard walks toward his home. Sheryl goes inside her house as happy as she can possibly be. She begins her afternoon work so that she will be free when Howard comes over that evening. Scene I, Act II takes place in the Wilsons' home. Mr. Wilson comes home from work. Sheryl is getting supper ready.

ACT II

MR. WILSON: Sheryl!

SHERYL: Yes, father?

FATHER: How was school today?

SHERYL: Oh, it was as usual.

FATHER: Supper ready yet?

SHERYL: (singing) Almost, as soon as you get washed up.

FATHER: What's on the menu for tonight?

SHERYL: You'll be surprised to find out.

FATHER: Ready or not, here I come. Boy, am I hungry!

SHERYL: Father, we are having company tonight.

FATHER: Oh yes, who?

SHERYL: Howard is coming over.

FATHER: So I see you have studying to do, huh?

SHERYL: Not really. (Door bell rings. Sheryl goes to answer it.)

SHERYL: Why Howard! won't you come in?

HOWARD: Sure. Is Mr. Wilson home?

SHERYL: Yes, would you want him to come in here with us?

HOWARD: Yes, I would.

SHERYL: (Goes to the door and calls out) Father, will you come into the living room?

FATHER: Yes, coming up.

HOWARD: Sure hope he is in a good mood.

SHERYL: I'm sure he is.

FATHER: (Enters the room yawning) Well, well, what do we have here?

HOWARD: Why, good afternoon, Mr. Wilson.

SHERYL: Father, Howard has something to ask you.

FATHER: Out with it. Where do you want to take Sheryl now?

HOWARD: Nowhere, but Sheryl and I have made an agreement.

FATHER: About what?

HOWARD: Well, we think that we are enough in love to face the responsibilities of getting married.

FATHER: (Interrupts) Married! Love! Oh no, not Sheryl! What has gotten into you two?

SHERYL: Oh, father, wait till he finishes.

FATHER: Wait till he what? Shut up.

HOWARD: Oh, I'm sorry this is such a shock to you, but, but....

FATHER: But what? No, no never, not Sheryl. Why she's all I have in the world now that her mother is dead.

HOWARD: But Mr. Wilson, we are in love. I do want to marry your daughter. I am sure I can support her. I am earning $7,000 a year.

FATHER: I don't care!

HOWARD: You don't what? But sir, Sheryl's future and happiness are at stake.

FATHER: She is happy here with me.

HOWARD: Oh yes. (pause) Still, Sheryl has to live her own life. Certainly if your wife were living, she wouldn't want you to deprive her of her marriage.

FATHER: Now, you just leave my wife out of this.

HOWARD: No I won't. Ever since your wife died you have been using Sheryl as a means of escaping the reality that she is dead. But it won't work, because I am going to marry your daughter whether you like it or not.

FATHER: Over my dead body.

HOWARD: Then that's the way it will be. (Facing Sheryl) When your old man gets some sense in his head, call me.

SHERYL: Oh I'm so sorry, Howard. Maybe I can try to get father to understand.

HOWARD: O.K. Good night.

SHERYL: (Running back to father crying) Father, how can you say such cruel things. After all, Howard and I are engaged.

FATHER: Engaged? Oh no. Who are you hollering at? And furthermore, who are you to decide your future? What's wrong with you, child?

SHERYL: (Runs out of the room crying) Oh, Dad, why, why....

Mr. Wilson lies on the couch and starts to think. He goes off in a deep sleep talking to himself. Then his wife appears to him as a spirit.

DAN: Oh why does she want to do it? What's the idea of him wanting to marry my baby? Please Lord, I can't let her leave me now, not like this anyway. Please, somebody tell me what to do. What am I going to do? What am I going to do? What am I going to do? (Asleep)

FRAM: (Appears as a spirit talking to her worried husband.) Oh, dear, why let things worry you? If I were there on earth with you I know things wouldn't be this way.

Of course I have never left you alone. We have had a happy marriage. Don't you think that Sheryl and Howard are capable of being as we once were? I know that you want Sheryl to be happy, so give her a chance.

DAN: But, Fram, darling, you just don't understand. Sheryl is all I have now. She just can't leave me.

FRAM: Make up your own mind, dear. I've given you my opinion, but don't cause Sheryl to lose her happiness because of you.

DAN: (Waking up rubbing his eyes) What am I doing? Who was I talking to? It couldn't have been Fram. No!

SHERYL: Father, wake up and go to bed.

FATHER: Sheryl, it's you. Sheryl. (Pauses) I have been doing some serious thinking. I am sorry I have been so mean. I think that you are old enough to decide your future, so you have my consent to marry Howard.

SHERYL: (Hugging her father, laughing very happily) Oh, Dad, I love you, you are so sweet. (Kisses his face) So now I can get married. Dad, you are the sweetest Dad in the world. Let me call Howard.

FATHER: I shall try to find satisfaction in her happiness.

(Curtain closes)

APPENDIX D-1: LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST: MASTER FORM

LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST
Placement and Evaluation of Students in the Communication Course
Master Form*

Part I: Grammar and Usage

1. Homonyms
   a. After all the excitement and extra work, she was to tired to go to sleep.
      As long as her daughter is to young to go to school, she can't accept a full time job.
      My two sisters were looking forward too the big event with great excitement. In a way I believe I was, too.
   b. We spent most of our time on the beach doing the summer.
      The child has been sick every since he was caught in the rain last week.
      I don't know whether I should except his invitation or not.

2. Apostrophe
   a. Its funny to see the kitten chase its tail.
      Its spring, and the garden is at its best.
      It's very windy, and the moon has hidden it's face behind a cloud.
   b. It's difficult to say whether Johns argument is better than hers.
      This is Mrs. Browns house; mine is across the street.
      He couldn't tell whether this was Marys book or yours.

3. Capital letter
   a. Sam graduated from the local High School when he was eighteen.
      If you do not have your library card, you are not allowed to check out books from the Library.

---

*Alternate forms of the local grammar test were compiled from the original master form. The three sentences under each item (1a, 1b, etc.) were used alternately in alternate forms of the test. The form that appears here has been slightly revised to eliminate weaknesses shown in actual testing. An actual test given to the students in May, 1964, is included in Appendix D-2.

My Mother loves all of her children, but she is most partial to her youngest boy.

b. More and more negroes are going to integrated schools in the South.

Many students use the local dialect rather than standard english.

You can take the intermediate course if you have had two years of french in high school.

4. Punctuation

a. I read Shakespeare's Hamlet this summer and enjoyed it very much.

Have you read the article about the English language in the current issue of Life?

The textbook we are using now is entitled Improving College English Skills, by Wilbur and Dabbs.

b. Mr. and Mrs. Brown moved to Orangeburg, South Carolina ten years ago.

Mr. and Mrs Brown moved to Orangeburg, South Carolina, ten years ago.

Yes Mary, I think you should stay in bed until the doctor says you can get up.

5. Run-on sentence

a. Mary and Jane had an argument, they have not talked to each other ever since.

Some students do not know why they want to go to college, they just go because others do.

Registration begins on Wednesday, classes begin two days later.

b. My glasses do not fit me any more, however, I can't afford to get a new pair just now.

Paperback books are very inexpensive, therefore most students can afford to buy more books than ever before.

The library is the heart of the college, if the heart does not function well, the whole institution will be weak and anemic.

6. Double negative

a. I don't want nobody to help me when I can do it myself.

John spent the whole afternoon downtown, but he didn't buy nothing.

My uncle can't trust nobody but himself.

b. The children can't hardly walk after hiking five miles.

They couldn't hardly leave the children outside in that kind of weather.

If Sam won't do it, I will not do it neither.

7. Double subject

a. My brother he went into the Army when he was only sixteen years old.

When I was very little, my mother she used to read stories to me at bed time.

Uncle John he was very nice to us boys, and we loved him like a father.

b. I like the cafeteria here, but some students they always complain about the food.

I always liked classical music, but Mary she preferred rock and roll, so we decided to change roommates.

The Democrats they didn't want a Republican president, and they were determined to get their own candidate elected.

8. Double comparison

a. Although you don't like your dress. I still think it's more prettier than mine.

The regular verbs are more easier to learn than the irregular verbs, since all regular verbs have the same ending for both the past tense and the past participle.

Don't you think it's more simpler to start all over again than to erase just part of the sentence?

b. The medicine that the doctor prescribed was more worse than the illness itself.

John wrote the composition over three times, but each time it came out worser no matter how hard he tried.

The medicine helped John relax and he felt more better after a good sleep.

9. Verb tense

a. Her husband is unemployed ever since he lost his job five months ago.

Your friends here all missed you very much since you were away.

I been here six months this September.

b. He give the burglar all the money he had, but the burglar thought he had some more hidden away.

They tried to help everyone who ask for help during the emergency.

The youngsters sang and dance merrily until ten o'clock last night.

10. Verb form (regular)

a. You are suppose to be back in the dormitory before curfew time.

I am not surprise to hear that he succeeded so well.
He didn't find the job difficult at all; he was use to that type of work.

b. They had finish cleaning up when the storm broke.
He had listen as carefully as he could, still he couldn't understand the lecture very well.
What the principal needs is an experience teacher to fill the vacancy.

c. John preferred to finished one job before starting another.
I wanted to stayed in bed because I had a very bad cold.
It was Mary's habit to washed her hair on Thursday evenings.

11. Verb form (irregular)

a. I might could do it if you would let me try, but I am not sure.
He could of finished the work on time, but he was interrupted by the unexpected visitor.
He could of come earlier instead of keeping everybody waiting for him.

b. The glass was broken when the children throw a ball at the window.
The workmen became ill after they had drank the polluted water.
Mary has wrote three letters to her mother since she left home.

c. Have you begun your examinations? We begun ours yesterday.
John hanged his coat in the closet last night, but he couldn't find it this morning.
My father built our house before my sister and I were borned.

d. Sam was almost drownded when he swam across the river.
Walter hitted three home runs and our team won by two points.
The balloon was blown against the wall and bursted.

e. The farmers had ate their breakfast before they began to work.
I was awaken by the heavy downpour which hit the roof like pebbles.
Most of the farmers growed corn, which rose to about five or six feet above the ground.

12. Subject-verb agreement

a. This author say that in spite of television, more and more people are reading more and more books.

John is the only one who always complains that he don't have enough time to read.
A radical don't just sit there and wait for things to happen.

b. Mrs. Willis is very weak after her long illness, and hardly ever get out of her bed these days.
Mrs. Johnson washes clothes every Monday and iron them every Tuesday.
A child who goes to school regularly learn more than the child who is absent half of the time.

c. I called your office this morning, but your secretary told me you was not there.
Father and Mother was not home at that time, and we children hardly knew what to do.
I am expected to attend the meeting this afternoon, ain't I?

d. A man with many responsibilities have to work very hard.
A person who enjoys reading good books never have to worry about being bored.
A student who knows how to take notes usually get good marks.

e. Neither you nor I are wrong; we simply reached the same conclusion in different ways.
According to the aptitude test, neither John nor Dick are qualified for the job.
Either Billy or Sam have to come with me to help me finish the work.

f. All the articles in this chapter deals with creative writing.
One of the boys in that group have a very good voice and a quick memory.
You had better call in the carpenter since all the windows in the house needs repair.

g. How are you and how is your parents?
There is several unabridged dictionaries in the library.
Here comes Mary and her sister, all ready for the party.

h. The woman with her two little children were here again yesterday.
The girl, as well as her younger brothers and sisters, were left penniless when her father died.
The queen, together with her attendants and escort, were honored at the dance.

13. Verbs misused

a. The water in the river raised three feet after a whole week of heavy rain.

No matter what we said to him, he just set there without saying a word.
John, you can sit the package on the table and see what's inside.

b. The book laid on the shelf all day yesterday, but this morning it wasn't there.
If you are so tired, you should lay down.
Mother said she would lay down for just a few minutes, but she slept the entire afternoon.

14. Noun plural

a. One of my brother is a lawyer, and the other teaches mathematics in high school.
There are some apple in the refrigerator in case the children want something to eat.
One of the biggest problem that they had to solve was the financial problem.

b. There were seven childrens in the family, three boys and four girls.
When I went in, there were three woman in the living room; my mother, my aunt, and a young lady about my age.
All the policewoman are on duty to help school children cross the street.

c. What are the criteria which the judges use in the beauty contest?**
Her father is an alumnus of Claflin College, and her mother is an alumna of State College.**
Scientists deduce their laws from systematic observations of natural phenomena.**

15. Noun possessive

a. If you want a copy of the college catalog, you can go to the registrar office to get one.
The children clothes should be kept clean and laundered frequently.
My mother's ideas of educating a child are different from my father.

16. Pronoun form

a. Between you and I, Sam is not a very honest man.
If you and Jane will do the decorations, Mary and me can help with the refreshments.
The teacher asked John and I to write the equation on the blackboard.

b. He is not fooling anybody when he cheats; he is only fooling hisself.
They are hurting nobody but theirselves if they insist on their unreasonable requests.

Do you think we can really solve this complicated problem ourself?

17. Pronoun reference
    a. Their car was stopped by a patrolman, which gave them a ticket for speeding.
       Everyone was supposed to bring their lunch, but several forgot to bring theirs.
       We lost our way and couldn't find anybody which could give us some information.

18. Adjective-adverb
    a. You should have heard Mary last night; she sang very good.
       It was a pity they didn't win the game; they played wonderful.
       With matching curtains and bedspreads, they fixed their room beautiful.
    b. It sounds real good, but I am afraid that it is too good to be true.
       Your dress is real pretty; I don't think anybody has a prettier one.
       John can run real fast; he won three prizes for the track team.
    c. When there is a fire, the firemen drive as fast as they can.**
       What is your mother cooking that smells so good?**
       Everything looks fresh and clean after the rain.**

19. Conjunction-preposition
    a. The little boy was so tired until he fell asleep on the rug.
       The auditorium was so crowded until many people had to stand in the aisle.
       The weather was so bad until we had to give up our plan for the picnic.
    b. This color is different than the color of your suit, which is a reddish brown.
       My schedule is different than yours since we are in different classifications.
       This school, being a private school, is different than tax supported schools in many respects.

20. Noun determiner
    a. This here book can give you the information you need.
       Do you know them boys who are playing over there?
       Don't you ever lose them pencils again; you won't get any more if you do.

b. Miss Smith was a elementary school teacher who knew how to help children.
Please give me a apple instead of a pear, if it doesn't make any difference to you.
The mathematics teacher gave us a examination almost every week.

**Sentences with two asterisks are correct sentences.

APPENDIX D-2: LOCAL GRAMMAR TEST: FORM USED IN MAY, 1964

Claflin College English Test
May, 1964

Name____________________________
(last) (first) (middle)

Section__________________________

Part I: Grammar and Usage

Directions: You will find a mistake in many of the sentences listed below. If you locate a misused or incorrect word, phrase, or punctuation in a sentence or a group of sentences, underline the mistake and write the correct form on the line at the right margin. If you do not find a single mistake, put a check on the line.

Examples: I ain't going to school. am not
John is my brother. ✓

1. One of the boys in that group have a very good voice and a quick memory. 1________
2. The glass was broken when the children throw a ball at the window. 2________
3. My two sisters were looking forward too the big event with great excitement. In a way I believe I was, too. 3________
4. John spent the whole afternoon downtown, but he didn't buy nothing. 4.________
5. You should have heard Mary last night; she sang very good. 5________
6. I am not surprise to hear that he succeeded so well. 6________
7. Registration begins on Wednesday, clases begin two days later. 7________
8. Neither you nor I are wrong; we simply reached the same conclusion in different ways. 8________
9. They tried to help everyone who ask for help during the emergency. 9________
10. Do you know them boys who are playing over there? 10________
11. The queen, together with her attendants and escort, were honored at the dance. 11________
12. Her father is an alumnus of Claflin College, and her mother is an alumna of State College. 12________
13. The book laid on the shelf all day yesterday, but this morning I didn't see it any more. 13________
14. This school, being a private school, is different than tax supported schools in many respects. 14________

15. John is the only one who always complains that he don't have enough time to read. 15________

16. He is not fooling anybody when he cheats; he is only fooling hisself. 16________

17. Most of the farmers growed corn, which rose to about five or six feet above the ground. 17________

18. There are some apple in the refrigerator in case the children want something to eat. 18________

19. No matter what we said to him, he just set there without saying a word. 19________

20. Its spring, and the garden is at its best. 20________

21. He had listen as carefully as he could, still he couldn't understand the lecture very well. 21________

22. The Democrats they didn't want a Republican president, and they were determined to get their candidate elected. 22________

23. Mr. and Mrs. Brown moved to Orangeburg South Carolina ten years ago. 23________

24. Walter hitted two home runs and our team won by two points. 24________

25. The children clothes should be kept clean and laundered frequently. 25________

26. I might could do it if you would let me try, but I am not sure. 26________

27. Although you don't like your dress, I still think it's more prettier than mine. 27________

28. I wanted to stayed in bed because I had a very bad cold. 28________

29. Everyone was supposed to bring their lunch, but several forgot to bring theirs. 29________

30. Mrs. Willis is very weak after her long illness, and hardly ever get out of her bed these days. 30________

31. My Mother loves all of her children, but she is most partial to her youngest boy. 31________

32. Your friend came three times since you went away. 32________

33. John can run real fast; he won three prizes for the track team. 33________

34. The class were very much upset because they weren't prepared for the test. 34________

35. The mathematics teacher gave us a examination almost every week. 35________

36. Here comes Mary and her sister, all ready for the party. 36________

37. Many students use the local dialect on the campus rather than speak good english. 37________

38. The medicine that the doctor prescribed was more worse than the illness itself. 38________

39. My brother he went into the Army when he was only sixteen years old. 39________

40. Father and Mother was not home at that time, and we children hardly knew what to do. 40__________

41. The library is the heart of a college, if the heart does not function well, the whole institution will be weak and anemic. 41__________

42. Have you begun your examinations? We begun ours yesterday. 42__________

43. Have you read the article about the English language in the current issue of Life? 43__________

44. If Sam won't do it, I will not do it neither. 44__________

45. When I went in, there were three woman in the living room: my mother, my aunt, and a young lady about my age. 45__________

46. The child has been sick every since he was caught in the rain last week. 46__________

47. This is Mrs. Browns house; mine is across the street. 47__________

48. Everything looks fresh and clean after the rain. 48__________

49. If you and Jane will do the decorations, Mary and me can help with the refreshments. 49__________

50. The weather was so bad until we had to give up our plan for the picnin. 50__________

APPENDIX E: GUIDE TO THE USE OF THE CHECK LIST FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE ESSAY TEST

I. Mechanical Errors

1. Capitalization--using a capital letter when none is needed, or failure to use a capital letter when one is required. (Exception: Failure to use an end punctuation mark and to capitalize the following word should be checked as one error under run-on sentence.)

2. Spelling--mispelled words and words divided incorrectly at the end of a line.

3. Punctuation--using wrong punctuation mark, failure to use a certain punctuation mark when it is needed, or the use of one when it is not needed. This should include failure to use the apostrophe or to use it in the wrong place, and failure to use a period at the end of an abbreviated word. (Exception: the use of comma, or no punctuation mark, instead of a semicolon or a period in a run-on sentence should be classified under run-on sentence.)

4. Run-on sentence--punctuating two or more sentences as one, with or without a conjunctive adverb. In a run-on sentence, the capitalization error and the punctuation error are counted as one error under this category.

5. Fragment--an incomplete sentence punctuated as a sentence.

II. Grammatical

1. Subject-verb agreement--failure to make subject, verb agree (usually in number) such as you was, or he go.

2. Verb tense--failure to use the correct tense, such as he go (or goes) yesterday.

3. Verb form--failure to use the correct principal part of a verb, such as to finished, could finished, had finish, had wrote, he begun, etc. Confusion between lie-lay, sit-set, rise-raise also comes under this category.

4. Double subject--such as *My father he is a fireman*.

5. Double negative--such as *I don't have nothing*.

6. Double comparison--such as *more prettier*, or *It is worser*.

7. Noun plural--failure to use the *s* ending to signify a plural noun, or inability to use the correct plural form of an irregular noun, such as *childrens*. (Using *my brother's* to indicate more than one brother is a mistake in punctuation.)

8. Noun possessive--failure to use the *s* ending to indicate the possessive case in nouns, such as *John book*, *my sister pin*, etc. (Failure to use the apostrophe, or to use it improperly, such as *Johns book* or *Johns' book*, should be classified under punctuation.)

9. Pronoun form--the use of wrong case form such as *between you and I* or *John and me go to school*; the use of substandard form such as *hisself*, *theirselves*, or *mines*, *yourn*, *hisn*; the use of *which* for *who* as a relative pronoun (as in *my uncle which is very rich*...), etc.
   Exception: The use of *who's* for *whose*, or *your's* for *yours* is a spelling or punctuation error. The use of *who* for *whom*, which is colloquially acceptable, is not counted.

10. Pronoun reference--the use of a pronoun without a clear antecedent, or lack of agreement in person or number between a pronoun and its antecedent.

11. Adverb vs. adjective--constructions such as *She sang beautiful*, or *He did good*.

12. Noun determiners*--the use of *a* for *an* or vice versa, or the use of *them slippers* for *these slippers*, etc.

---

*Errors in this category, which occurred only sporadically in the students' essays and interviews, are not included in the statistics which are based on five major categories of verb, noun, pronoun, adjective vs. adverb, and double constructions only.

APPENDIX F: AN EXAMPLE OF ESSAY EVALUATION

1. An Initial Essay

Frank Allen

Sept. 6, 1963

Mr. Alexander Graham Bell

The time of this forerunning period was centered about the 18 century. During this period of time men wore tall stove pipe hats and were beared. Ladies wore long dresses and bonnets almost of their presence in society.

Mr. Bell was a man of an intellectual curosity with vast experiences. Many friend of Mr. Bell learned and shared in his present and future outlooks of the world.

Mr. Bell, being curous of his enviroment, developed the idea of communication with other in a distant not nearby. He studied Science curously, and probably his foundation for invention(s) were developed.

Mr. Bell's first attemp of examining his invention was not entirely successful. Through continuing efforts with his associate, Mr. Bell invention proved a success at his request for help.

The people of his enviroment were all stunned and gradified upon his acheivement.

Modern men have carried out Mr. Bell's dream to the best of their creative minds.

In a final analsysis, as a result of Mr. Bell achievement, many useful invention were developed and many more will be, only if each generation will profit and try to improve situations that came before them.

2. A Final Essay

Frank Allen

English Bl

Telephone Courtesy Pays Of

This story tells of problems that may happen in a office when one neglects the proper forms of courtesy. Possessing or encouraging courtesy in telephoning was the main helpful hint one could have gotten from the story. The story began when Mr. Burton, president of the Art Coroporation, was frustrated because of a malfunction of the motor in his car. He telephoned his secretary and tried to get a message accross to Mr. Jackson, the man who wants to buy the Art Coroporation's designs. Because his workers were not courteous in answering and calling over the telephone, a serious problem resulted which could have cost Mr. Burton's Coroporation a vast sum of money. After a representative of the telephone company came and explained why things happened as they did, Mr. Burton made an encouraging speech to his workers and business around the office went smoothly there after.

3. Evaluation Check List for Essay Test

Name Frank Allen

First Essay	Second Essay
No. of Words ____ Date Sept. 6, 1963	No. of Words ____ Date ____
I. Mechanical 1. capital letter /	
2. spelling ///// ///// //	/////
3. punctuation	
4. run-on sentences	
5. fragment	
II. Grammatical 1. subject-verb agreement /	
2. verb tense /	
3. verb form	
4. preposition /	
5. double subject	
6. double negative	
7. double comparison	
8. noun plural //	
9. possessive //	
10. pronoun form /	
11. pronoun reference	
12. adverbs-adjectives	
13. sentence structure	
Mechanical errors: total 13 EPHW ____ Grammatical errors: total 8 EPHW ____	Mechanical errors: total 5 EPHW ____ Grammatical errors: total 0 EPHW ____

APPENDIX G: AN EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW EVALUATION

1. An Initial Interview

ALICE BROWN*

September 23, 1963

Will you give me your name, your home town and the section of English you're in?

My name is Alice Brown, I'm from Timmonsville, South Carolina, and my section is B-2.

All right. You want to tell me something about Timmonsville, South Carolina?

Well....

Main Street and town?

Oh!

Describe it.

Well, we have, uh....

Don't worry about the tape recorder. Just go ahead and tell me anything about Main Street as you remember it.

Well, we have a new bank and, uh, they, uh, they remodeled the streets. It's just a one way drive and....

What kind of stores do you have on Main Street?

Uh, we have chain stores.

All right. Clothing stores?

Clothing stores and gro--grocery stores.

What about your drug stores?

We have drug stores, too.

Then I gather that this is a moderately small town.

Yes.

I see. Tell me something, well--tell me anything about Timmonsville that interests you most.

---

*The name used here has been disguised.

Going to school there.

Then tell me about the school there.

Uh, the name of the school I graduated from is Johnson High and it goes from the sixth through the twelfth, and it--it's modern and up-to-date, it um....

How is it shaped? What is it made of?

It's brick.

Brick?

Yes.

Does it have a form like a "T" or an "H" or something like that? --You haven't paid any attention to it, have you? All right.

No, not really.

All right. Tell me something about its curriculum and its extracurricular activities.

Well, um, such as basketball. We have a basketball team, football team, and we have a dramatics club, science club and, uh, this year we have physical education wherein we didn't have it before, and we have a library and....

What about your courses, your science department, something about the curriculum in this area?

Chemi'....

You have had a chemistry class?

Yes, chemistry and uh....

Do you have physics?

We have physics, yes, and we have algebra.

Algebra, that's in the math department. What about the English department?--You just have English?

Yes.

All right. You said that you had a chemistry class and I'm wondering if you had a laboratory.

Uh, you may call it....

Well, tell me what you had that you used as a laboratory.

A classroom.

You used a classroom?

Yes.

What kind of experiments were tried or used for demonstrations to the class?

Well, I didn't take chemistry in high school.

Uh, you didn't?

No.

So that you don't really know but you know how this room looks?

Yes.

Can you tell me what's in it?

Uh, it's something similar to the one in the science building, only it's not that large because it has desses around on the side. They have, I can't, uh.... We have desses and stools, foot stools to sit to so you can carry on demonstrations.

All right. Then suppose you tell me something about the extracurricular activities that you participated in.

Well, I was in the dramatics club.

All right. Tell me something about the last play that was presented by the dramatics club, describing characters, not by real name but by the part they played.

Well, the last play was, uh--uh--"Itching to Get Hitched" and the characters were Pearly Mae Snead, I play--I played--I portrayed Pearly Mae Snead, and, uh, Ma Snead, Pa Snead and Hank Salley, Uncle Fud and Lizzie Snead and, uh, Preacher Bessie Smith.

All right. Describe the characters you had to portray, something other than what they ordinarily live.

Uh, these were backward people, uh, you know.

Yes?

They had these old ideas....

Hill-billy people.

...and they lived in a shaggy house and Ma--she had on this dirty dress as usual and Pa had patched overalls with suspenders, and Pearly Mae was a pretty girl around 16 and Hank Salley was a sloopy looking, tall fellow and Uncle Fud, he--he usually carry a jug of whiskey around which he called his medicine, and Preacher Bessie Smith--she was a hard working lady, and, uh, they always trying to get their children hitched. Finally Pearly Mae Snead married Hank Salley.

It should have been quite interesting. Sort of reminds me of the hill-billies. All right. What are your special hobbies?

Well, I like softball.

All right. Tell me about softball. Tell me how to play it.

Well, it consists of 10 girls. It's something almost like baseball only we have a larger ball and, uh, we have a first baseman, second baseman, third baseman, center field, left center field, pitcher, catcher and, um, my position was second baseman, and persons--the team that has many--has most scores wins the game.

All right. How does one score in the game?

By hitting the ball, getting the most runs.

Tell me the different positions you have in a softball game. Just name the ones you can think of at this point.

Positions?

Yes.

I can na'....

No, I was thinking in terms of functions. You see, you would have to tell me the name in order to tell me the function. If you have an outfielder, what does he do?

Well, he catches the ball that comes in the field. At least, he tries to.

All right.

And the first baseman, well, she is there to try to keep you from going to the second, and the second baseman, she is behind the pitcher almost, wherein if the pitcher gets the ball, she can throw it to second and there will be an out if she catches it. But you have to touch the person on baseman, on second base. If she is coming, you have to touch the person wherein if you are on first base you can, you know--you can stand there and catch the ball with your foot on the mat and the person is out. But it's different with the second and third base, you have to do the same as you do on the second.

All right. Are you interested in softball enough to tell me me something of what they play now in the league? What they are leading up to in the league? Maybe some of the games during the past summer.

Well, first of all this, uh, the churches, the com--the community development plan, it was designed to keep young people out of trouble on weekends. You know, that's on Saturdays where we travel to communities to play ball every Saturday, and,uh, the person--we, uh, after the season is over and we have the tournament, well, the community that wins gets the trophy.

What communities participated in this?

Well, Cottageville, Timmonsville, uh--uh, Hyman, uh, Pamplico, uh, Meadow Prom. There were a lot of them. I can't think right....

I see. They were the surrounding communities?

Yes.

Who sponsored the team? I guess you would call it the Little League or the Women's League or whatever you want to, but you just --you just organized on your own?

No, it's, uh--it is the community development plan wherein the churches are included and, uh, Mr. Pearson, I don't know his full name but he was over everything.

I see. That's quite interesting--quite interesting, and it's the first time I heard of something like this. All right. Let's go to something else. You have three pictures on the desk in front of you. Look at them carefully and tell me which you would like to talk about.

This one.

All right. Tell me what you see on this picture.

Well, it looks like this is in Washington and, uh, I see a building and it looks like the capitol.

No, tell me what you see. It doesn't matter what you think.

I see a lot of cars, a lot of buildings, houses, trees and I see a few stores, church....

You said it looks like Washington at first, have you had a trip to Washington?

No, just merely passing through.

I see. Can you describe some large city that you have visited?

Well, recently I was in New York....

Go ahead.

...and well, you know New York, it's very pretty at night but in the day time when you can see things by its natural color, it don't look the same.

Describe the difference for me.

In the Bronx where I lived there are a lot of other people there with different nationalities. And the streets, they are kind of dirty. It um--but in the--I--I--went over to Harlem, you know, where it use to be a slum, it's not as bad as they--as it use to be because they have cleaned up a lot of places building projects, and I went to Far-A-Rockaway--that's on an island and it's almost like the country. People have imitation brick covering on their houses, mosquitoes, flies and dirt roads, and....

Can you describe some of the buildings as you see them in the picture? Can you compare the buildings in New York with what you see in that picture?

Well, the project, uh, just alike.

They are just alike?

Yes.

What do you see in the picture that seems to be different?

The buildings don't look as old as the buildings in New York.

Tell me something about the buildings in New York as you saw them.

Well, they were dark and gloomy looking from the outside, mostly brick and....

All right. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me--that you haven't said or talked about?

No.

O.K. Thank you so much.

2. A Final Interview

ALICE BROWN

May 4, 1964

Will you give me your name, your home town, and the section of English you're in?

My name is Alice Brown, and I'm from Timmonsville, South Carolina, and I am in B-2 section of English.

All right, Miss Brown. Will you tell me something about an interesting incident that you have had this year at Claflin?

Uh, one of my most interesting incident at Claflin was during the demonstrations downtown. I was arrested September 22, 1963.

Tell me about the incident.

Well, it was unexpected to me because, uh, when we were marching downtown, the policeman said that you are under arrest, and I had never been arrested before and we--first of all, we sat down on the street and then we moved back on the lawn and they threatened to throw water on us with the fire hose. And so we got up and then we marched on to jail singing The Freedom Song.

All right. What happened when you got inside? Just relax.

Well, after we got inside the wire fence we were still singing and then they took us on the inside, five at a time, and we gave our names and our home towns and where we are going to school and they put us on a bus and took us to the armory which is located in Orangeburg.

All right. Can you describe the armory for me?

Well, it's a big building, brick, and on the inside it looks like a gymnasium. There were, uh, two basketball goals and, uh, some barrels, I think some barrels.

You don't know what kind of barrels?

No.

They were just big barrels?

Yes, and there I met some of the students from Claflin and some of the students from South Carolina State College.

All right. How long did you stay at the armory?

I stayed two days and three nights.

Was this the time that Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Worthy worked with the girls or stayed with them at night?

Yes, it was.

I see. Now tell me about the attitudes of the other young ladies behind the locked door who were unable to go out at will.

Well, the young ladies as a whole were nice. We were all sitting around talking about what is happening at State and what is happening at Claflin.

So you had enough to occupy your time for the full two days?

Yes, and we also had books to read and occasionally they let us play the radio that we had.

Um, so you had a fine time, didn't you?

Yes, and Mrs. Smith kept coming and she would bring us candy and all sorts of things.

To munch on?

Yes, and the food was pretty nice, you know.

All right. Suppose we go to something else. Suppose I ask you to describe or compare a student as a freshman entering in September with that same student as he leaves in May; you have had the chance, I am sure, to watch one or two students closely. Without giving me his or her name, tell me what kind of improvement he or she has made since last September.

Well, I have noticed a student, particularly. She--I can tell that she has a good background during her high school years and today she has made the Dean's List and, uh, she is very studious, and because practically any time you would go into the library you would see her there getting her lessons out.

All right. Now was her attitude one of acceptance--acceptance when she came here?

Yes, she was.

So that she was just about prepared for school. Her period of adjustment was not long nor hard, was it?

No, it wasn't.

I see. Has she done the same kind of work the second semester that she did the first?

Yes, I think so.

All right. What makes a campus hero?

Well, if he is good in his classroom work and he participates in all the activities, and, well, naturally he is a campus hero if --if he outstands among the rest of the students.

I see. So he really has to accomplish something?

Yes.

Does Claflin have a campus hero? If so, you don't have to tell me his name but tell me about him, his personal attitude, his character.

Do you want to know if this campus hero is graduating now?

No, well, you can tell me that, it's all right. I just want to know if we have one and if we do, tell me something about him. Describe him to me. Tell me about his attitude.

Well, the president of the student body, I think.

O.K.

Well, I have, myself--I find him to be very nice and, uh, in his classroom study--Remember when they took the National Teachers Examination? I think that he scored an A on it. I'm not sure.

Oh he did?

Yes, and he mix--he mixes with the children, well, the students that is, and, uh, whenever we have something that is very important I think that he carries on well when, uh, he is on the stage and we are in the audience and we have company, and, you know.

All right. You want to take another deep breath and let it out slowly so you won't be so tense?--Look at the pictures on the desk and choose one of the three to describe in detail and to use the people that you see in the picture for characters in a short story, a story of which you, yourself, will be the author. Everything will be original with you. --All right, describe it in detail.

Well, uh, in this picture there are--there are two buildings, I think, and it's down by the water front and there are two statues and there are a lot of people in the street, some, uh, walking next to the water front, and some just standing there and the others are down to the front watching this boat. The street is made of bricks, with blocks. There are three wooden benches. That's all.

What about the people? Where are they walking? Do they seem to be going in the same direction?

They all seem to be going toward the water front.

All right. What's there?

There is a--is a ship or a small boat on the water, uh, and there are also some small canoes tied to the water front. And there is a statue of a lion and also a statue of a man holding, uh, it seems as though, a fish or something.

All right. You want to develop your story from the people by giving some definite information. This is a definite city, at a definite time and a definite program. Don't use "probably" or "would." Just say they are doing....

Uh, in the picture there are people at the water front who are watching a ship. They are all moving next to the water front. There is a statue of lion--of a lion and there is a statue of a man holding a fish, uh, and the street is made of brick, and there are blocks. The city is Charleston, South Carolina. And there are two large buildings with benches situated on the streets. The people are standing, some with small children and the others seem to be moving down toward the edge of the water front. There are small canoes tied to the water front.

What is happening at the water front? You say everybody seems to be moving down toward the water front.

There is a--is a boat on the water. Maybe it's a fishing boat.

You think they are all going out to sea?

From the picture some are looking and the others seem to be standing up talking.

All right. How do most people get their living? How do they make a living in a city such as--you said it was Charleston. From the picture tell me what kind of livelihood these people have.

Usually when a town is situated near a water front, the people there--some of the people work at the shipyard, if there are shipyards and, uh, some fish for a living.

All right. What do most women do? What would they be likely to do?

Well, the women probably stay home and....

Do house work?

Yes.

Take care of their families.

Yes.

All right. Let's turn to something else, taking our minds away from the picture. Tell me your favorite T.V. show. Tell me all about it.

Uh....

What you used to look at most? Can you remember?

Uh, my favorite T.V. program is the "Defender."

All right. Why do you like the "Defenders"? Isn't it "Defenders"?

Yes, there are two, the father and the son.

Yes. Tell me why do you like the "Defenders"?

Well, they always--their clients--it seems to me every time there is a case the clients are always freed.

Which means that they win the case; they win all their cases?

Yes, practically all the time because when there is a person in jail for--for a crime, well, they go and they get all back evidence and they just stir up everything and they find the person innocent.

I see.

...wherein a person had been in jail for a crime which he didn't commit.

A kind of case that an ordinary lawyer would not take, but a case in which a person has been convicted unjustly and there seems not to be a possible answer or defense?

Yes.

All right. Tell me some kind of story or one kind of story presented on "The Defenders," a story that you remember.

Well, there was a man in jail, and he committed a crime and he said that he didn't commit the crime but he had and, uh, the defenders, well, they had another trial and he was found innocent and after the trial was over with, then he confessed that he committed the crime.

Now his acquital came through the work of the defenders or was this just in spite of the defenders?

Well, this was done, I would say, in spite of the defenders because he knew that he had committed the crime and yet the defenders thought that he were--that he was innocent but he wasn't, and after the trial was over, well, he admitted his crime.

The kind of situation where a man can't be tried for the same offence twice?

Yes, this was the type of situation.

All right. What are your summer plans?

Well, my plans are I--my parents live in New York--and I plan to go there and live with them and probably get a job for the summer and--that's all my plans.

To work toward seeing yourself in school next year?

Yes.

All right. Is there anything further you would like to place on tape?

No.

All right. Thank you so much.

3. Evaluation Check List for Oral Interviews

Name Alice Brown

First Interview	Second Interview
Date Sept., 1963	Date May, 1964
Part I	
1. d for th	
2. w for wh	
3. in for ing	
Part II	
1. noun plural	/
2. possessive	
3. verb tense /	///
4. verb form //	
5. subj.-verb agreement	
6. double subject ///// //	
7. double negative	
8. double comparison	
9. use of preposition /	
10. adj.-adv.	
11. pronoun (form)	
12. pronoun (reference) ///// //	/